

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

APR 25 1951

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

APRIL 1951

Price 4s.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

ARTICLES

- Jesus and His Gospel, since Schweitzer, T. Francis Glasson, M.A., D.D.
The Theology of Missions—The Contribution of P. T. Forsyth, D. W. Lambert, M.A.
Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950), John F. Butler, M.A., Ph.D.
Wilfred Monod (1867-1943), Henry Hogarth, B.A.
The Soul's Awakening—A Study of Youth, Albert D. Selden, D.D.
The Coming Great Church, Henry Pitney van Dusen
A Fresh Discussion of Revelation, W. F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D.
Society for the Reformation of Manners, T. D. Mandley, B.A., B.D.

ECUMENICAL SURVEY

- Methodism in Latin America, Santo Uberto Barbieri, D.D.
Ordination in Methodism, A. Raymond George, M.A.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

- Some Recent Continental Contributions to New Testament Study, W. F. Howard, F.B.A., M.A., D.D.
Monsieur Knorr's Eschatology, Henry Bett, M.A., Litt.D.
Grammar-school Divinity, J. Butcherworth, B.D.

RECENT LITERATURE, Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

FROM MY NEW SHELF, C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
FRANK · H · CUMBERS

25-35 · CITY ROAD · E.C.1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller at 4s. a copy (postage 3d.) or 15s. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Golden Links

By CECIL F. WALPOLE

Foreword by Rev. Dr. Leslie Weatherhead

Golden Links tells the story of the family and friends of the National Children's Home, and the new and revised edition (1950) brings the story right up-to-date. The book is full of incidents and of human interest and has been well described as a study of love in action.

PRICE 5/-



Obtainable from:

National Children's Home, Highbury Park, London, N.5
or The Epworth Press, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1

P

8

a

'

o

g

e

u

o

h

v

v

J

C

M

c

c

l

f

l

a

i

c

a

l

c

Editorial Comments

FLETCHER OF MADELEY—AN INTERESTING MANUSCRIPT

THERE has recently come into our hands what is believed to be a manuscript book of sermon-notes written by Fletcher of Madeley. Through the kindness of Mrs Moulton Wood (*née* Coleman) and the good offices of the Rev. G. H. B. Sketchley, it has now been added to the valuable collection of Wesleyana at the Book-Room.

The little note-book (6 ins. \times 4 ins.) is paper-covered and bears the date '1764, January' on the back and front. In the opinion of Percy Coleman and others the notes are in Fletcher's handwriting. This would hardly of itself guarantee the authorship of the manuscript; but there is an additional piece of evidence which we feel confirms it. The sermon-notes are, for the most part, undated, but in four cases there are place-names (in the right-hand top corner of the first page of the outline) and these evidently refer to the church in which he preached. Two of these contain the word Breedon, written in very small writing a little later than the notes themselves. It is clear that the sermons were made in 1764, and in 1765 we know that Fletcher preached for a few weeks in this Leicestershire village. In the *Works of John Fletcher* published by John Mason, the first volume consists of a biography by the Rev. Joseph Benson. On page 127 the following passage occurs: 'In or about the year 1765, Mr Fletcher, and Mr Sellon, of Breedon in Leicestershire supplied each others churches for a few Sabbaths. While Mr Fletcher remained at Breedon, people of various descriptions, flocked to hear him from all the parishes adjacent.' He was thirty-six years of age, at this time, and John Wesley had known him for, at least, twelve years. Since Joseph Benson explains that he has based his book on Wesley's 'narrative' of *The Life of the Rev. John W. de la Flechere* and the 'biographical notes' of the Rev. Mr Gilpin, there can be no doubt as to its accuracy.

The little manuscript becomes more than an interesting example of the homiletics, expositions, and evangelical appeal of the period, in so far as it illustrates Fletcher's theological outlook and, in one or two instances, his views on controversial matters.

The book contains forty-two closely written pages, consisting of twenty-three sets of notes. One text has five separate outlines, evidently the result of experience in preaching the sermon.

They vary in length, and in quality; some are direct and simple, others more discursive. The texts chosen are 1 John 3^s, John 14^s, Isaiah 51^s, Luke 14^{ss-ss}, Matthew 27^{ss-ss}, Acts 5^{ss}, Philippians 2^s, 1 Corinthians 2^s, Isaiah 40^{ss}, Joshua 24^{ss} (two sets), 2 Corinthians 7^s, 1 Corinthians 15^{ss-7}, Luke 14^{ss}, John 3⁷, Ephesians 4^{ss-10} (Ascension Day), Acts 2^{ss}, Psalm 43^{ss-4}, and Ephesians 3^s (five different outlines).

The following is an example of the simpler type:

John 14^a—I am the way.

I. From a state of sin and wrath—Misery.

To a state of peace and holiness—Glory.

1. He was made sin for us.
2. He sustained the wrath of God.
3. He purchased peace, righteousness and joy.

II. What kind of way Christ is.

1. A *Free* way. Yet the opening cost him dear.
Free for sinners of all ranks—age—&c.
2. A *Safe* way. No man plucketh them out of my hand. I'll fear no evil—
Ps. 23.
3. A *Lightsome* way. Morning stars sing. He that followeth me etc.
4. A *Near* way. He is near that just. The word is nigh. The Word was made
flesh and dwelt among us.
5. A way where there is a *guide*. They shall be taught.
6. A *Firm* way. No fear of sinking—Ps. 40¹² (?)
7. A *Delightful* way. (Her ways are ways of pleasantness.)
8. A way with all manner of *accommodation*—gratis. The *tree of life*—the
fountain of living waters, the bread of life, wine and milk, balm of Gilead,
banqueting house.
9. An easy and *plain* way. The wayfaring man tho' a fool.
10. A *wide* way to 'those that walk in ye Spirit'.
11. A way that grows wide and finer as one travels it, (the light of the just
shineth more and more. Prov.) (I will run the ways of thy command-
ments now thou hast set my. . . .)

That is perhaps the simplest of the outlines, but each one has its own peculiar interest, and the little book as a whole gives some idea of the kind of sermons preached in the third quarter of the eighteenth century.

When he was at Breedon he preached from Acts 2³⁶⁻⁴⁰, especially stressing verse 37: 'Now when they heard this they were pricked in their heart and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?'

How far it was the personality and conviction of the preacher which attracted the crowds from the surrounding parishes, and how far it was the power and directness of the evangelical appeal, it is difficult to judge. One can, at least, be sure that there was something unusual about this approach to personal experience. Like Whitefield and the Wesleys, Walker of Truro, and a few others John Fletcher stirred the hearts of the indifferent or despondent people whose spiritual life had all but perished in the aridity of the eighteenth century. Wherever these men went, with their vital message, they created an oasis in what was to the common folk a desert. All very well to talk of the Augustan Age and to paint a picture of the quality on a canvas splashed with splendid colour, but the people of Breedon, or of Madeley, knew nothing of such a scene.

It would be easy enough to criticize the sermon he preached that day at Breedon, but it would have been a blasphemy to the men and women to whom it brought new hope and purpose. Here is an exact reproduction of the outline:

Introduction from the day of Pentecost approaching & St. Peter's successful sermon and Apostolic Doctrine.

I What gave occasion to St. Peter to preach that Sermon.

1. The miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost.
2. The great concourse of all the People of Jerusalem.

II What was it that they heard.

1. That they had crucified Jesus.
2. That God had made him Lord & Christ v. 36.

III What effect this doctrine and plain application had.

They were pricked in their heart which implies

1. Their conscience was allarm'd. the dumb dog barked.
2. Remove Guilt (the sting of death) prick'd not their head, nor their skin, but *heart*.
3. They instantly died to all their former hopes and goodness, a prick in the heart is *mortal*.
4. A prodigious change appear'd in them.
 1. They were so earnest as to interrupt the Apostle & cry out (before all) pleading guilty without excuse.
 2. They call'd *brethren* & consulted those they thought right.
 3. They acknowledged their *ignorance*. What shall we do?
 4. They were ready to be put upon anything. What?

so. Saul and the Jailor.

IV Answer of Peter to the awful question.

1. Repent—on, add Evangelical to Legal Repentance.
2. Be Baptised, or stand to your Baptism in the name of J.
3. Believe the Remission of sins & have the Holy Ghost.

Encouragement. The promise is to you and your children for the Lord calls you now. Exhortation. Save yourselves from this untoward generation.

1. Application. I charge you with the crucifying of Xt. Sin is the spear, nails & hammer.
2. I charge you (some) with crucifying him afresh & putting him to an open shame by your backsliding.
3. I testify and declare that Jesus is your *Lord* and if you relent he is your *Christ*.
4. Ye self righteous let the sword of God's Spirit prick you to the heart and slay your vain hopes.
5. Conviction & faith come by hearing, hear the word of the Lord, O Earth, & believe.
6. Ye revilers & persecutors, Learn to call (us) Brethren.
7. Ye careless ones. Ask the important Question. What. Away with all your false pleas. I do all I can. Not what shall I do to be rich, to kill time, indulge y^e flesh.
8. Take Peter's advice, from the Rock of Repentance plunge into the Sea of Xt's blood, wash your sins. Receive y^e Hy. Ghost.
9. Believe the promise, it is yours, & your children.
10. Receive & follow the word of Exhortation from your minister, from me—Save yourselves from this—Gener: as Lot out of Sodom, as Israel out of Egypt. The destroyer is at your heels. enter y^e into the peace, holiness & happiness of the primitive Xtn. 3000.

This simple outline is fairly typical of the majority in this manuscript but there is one which has a peculiar importance, because it shows the attitude of Fletcher, at this time, to the question of accommodation for the people called Methodists. The various stages in the struggle to repeal the Conventicle Acts have been described elsewhere.¹ One of the sermon outlines contains Fletcher's partial vindication of the right of the people to hold meetings in private houses. In later years he would have spoken even more strongly, and did, in fact, set apart a preaching-room in the Tythe-Barn at Madeley for Mary Bosanquet after she became his wife.² In this building, quite distinct from the parish Church, services were held regularly, and large congregations came to hear a woman preach in an improvised room!

The sermon in which he refers to this problem is based on the words in Acts 5:42: 'And daily in the temple and in every house they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.' The three main headings are: I. What it is to teach and preach Jesus Christ. II. Where teaching and preaching Jesus Christ ought to take place (temple and everywhere). III. How often Jesus Christ ought to be preached—daily. Under the second heading examples are given from the Scriptures and then various current objections are answered. They include the criticism that the preaching of the early Christians in private houses was through fear of persecution. This is answered by quoting the context in Acts 5, to the effect that the preachers found favour with the people. Amongst other objections is the fact that 'This (i.e. preaching in private houses) is not allowed in the Church'. The answer contains these points. '1. Our Church is not against the Bible. 2. Canon 71. No preaching nor adm. Sac. but *in case of necessity* in private houses. But if there is a *necessity* seeing the ignorance of Churchmen—and Busy endeavour of Dissenters. 3. Canon 73 forbids to hold conventicles or secret meetings, to *Empeach* and deprave the doctrine of the Church of England. 4. Canon 49 allows a minister examined by the Bishop and duly licensed to expound in his own cure or *elsewhere* any Scripture or matter of doctrine. 5. Objection. But no clergyman does so—yes—At Gospel places, Vicarages. Bishop Latimer: sermon before King Edw.

'Bishop's charge: "It is your office to seek for Christ the sheep (?) that are dispersed abroad—Cease not your labour, care and diligence. Will you be ready with all faithful diligence to drive away all strange doctrine and to use both public and private exhortations, as need shall require and occasion shall be given."'

On Good Friday, 1764, he preached on I Corinthians 2: 'I determined not to know any thing among you save Jesus Christ and him crucified.' On Easter Day his text was from Isaiah 40:1-2: 'Comfort ye, comfort ye my people. . . .' The most curious of his outlines is one to which he gave the title, Day of the Eclipse. His text was in Matthew 27:45-50 and his three main divisions (1) Some observations on the nature & meaning of that Darkness (2) On the amazing cry of our suffering, dying Lord. In the first part of the sermon he evidently spent some time over references in Phlegon, Thalles, Eusebius, Africanus and Dionysius and then passed to that deeper darkness that gathered about the Cross, to the cry of dereliction and the unutterable sorrow that was the measure of God's love.

¹ Leslie F. Church, *The Early Methodist People* (The Epworth Press), Chapter 2.

² Leslie F. Church, *More About the Early Methodists* (The Epworth Press), Chapter 4.

Times have changed and the preacher's technique has altered, but there is much in this tattered little book with its straightforward messages that stirs the heart.

The sermons were preached to varied congregations, as the tiny notes record. The villagers of Madeley and Breedon, of Hodnet and Wellington, heard them eagerly, but so also did my Lady Huntingdon and her friends at Bath and at Derby. As he spoke to the men of Markifield on Ascension Day, 1764, from Ephesians 4^{a-10} there is evidence of his passionate concern for the individual and his fearless appeal to them in their great need. The outline ends with a group of what he calls 'inferences':

1. Is Christ descended to seek & save thee. Meet him, receive him, embrace, love, admire follow & rejoice in him.
2. Is he ascended up, give up low thoughts & base delights, follow him to heaven in thoughts, desires, resolutions, prayer.
3. Hath he led captivity captive, then be no more intangled in the yoke of sin & satan's bondage, act faith.
4. Did he ascend to give gifts, his spirit. Open the hand of faith, receive them as gifts, cast them not away, use them to Xt's honor.
5. Did he ascend to fill up all things, let him empty and fill thy heart, thy life, thy mouth with love, good works and praises.

Turn these inferences (if time permit) for reproof and terror, he will come again with terrible majesty.

The ink has faded on the time-worn pages, but the light seems still to shine, as one remembers the hopes that were kindled and lives that were quickened by this gentle Swiss preacher who was a flaming evangelist.

TOMLINSON OF MYSORE

A NEW VOLUME is to be published by the Christian Literature Society, Madras, in their *Indian Research Series*. It is concerned with the life and writing of William Ernest Tomlinson, who, from 1900 to 1944 gave his life to the people of Mysore. Early in 1944 he had begun to write a book on the preaching of the Gospel in India. Only three chapters had been finished when he died, but even this fragment, with a selection from his other writings, will be of great value in solving the problems which face the Christian preacher in modern India. The editing of this literary material has been undertaken by the Rev. A. Marcus Ward, M.A., of the United Theological College, Bangalore. A Memoir, an early edition of which we have been privileged to read, is the work of the Rev. N. Carr Sargent, B.A., of Shimoga. This dual authorship of the new book is a happy arrangement, for both men, like the man of whom they write, have given themselves to Mysore.

The very mention of Mysore revives schoolboy memories of Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan and the somewhat dreary hours spent mastering the story of their campaigns. Unfortunately, our history books told us little or nothing of the years that followed—when the Hindu dynasty was restored and the first missionaries came. Nor did we know of the Rajah's failure, of the establishment of a British Commission to administer the territory and the magnificent work accomplished by Christian missionaries for the next half century. When the

time came for the Commission to hand over the administration to a new and younger Maharajah he was able to turn to Indian officials educated in mission schools and well fitted to undertake the government of the new democratic State.

During the next twenty years men like Henry Haigh, G. W. Sawday, D. A. Rees, Henry Gulliford, W. W. Holdsworth, and J. Alfred Vane, carried on the great Mysore tradition. When Tomlinson arrived on the Field in 1900 he found E. W. Redfern, E. W. Thompson, and W. H. Thorp, already pledged to evangelize the country and to influence the life of the people by means of schools, hospitals, and Christian literature.

It was not long before he had achieved what Sargant describes as a 'complete mastery of the language, its prose and poetry' and had become an accomplished writer and speaker in Kanarese. Though he was first and foremost an evangelist, he had distinct gifts as a schoolmaster. His first appointment was to the Mysore High School, and almost at once he learned the names of every one of the eight hundred boys. His originality as a teacher and his prowess as a footballer won their admiration and allegiance. He might have become a successful Headmaster, but his call to concentrate on preaching the Gospel to the Hindus would not be denied.

This was no simple matter, as Mr Sargant makes plain, for any talk of a personal God, a holy God, human responsibility and consciousness, immediately touched not only the philosophy of the Hindus but their mythologies, indeed their essential pantheism and their doctrine of *karma*. To convince them of the separate personalities of God and of man must be followed up by revealing the moral attributes of this personal God. Great stretches of country challenged him, and he did not hesitate.

Long tours of the larger villages were constantly being made. Conversations by the wayside, in the precincts of the temples and at the *Jātres* or religious fairs were opportunities he seized eagerly. The account of such journeyings is reminiscent of the Gospels. This does not mean that Tomlinson confined himself to preaching to the outcastes. On the contrary a great deal of his attention was fixed on the caste Hindu, and on those educated men who, influenced by Western civilization, accepted their Hinduism with what Dr Haigh described as 'scornful accommodation'. It needed unlimited patience and a mighty faith to continue preaching to the landowners and conservative peasant farmers, when visible results were so few.

He had determined that he must do what he could to instruct the new Christians, whose knowledge of Christianity was pathetically meagre. To quote Mr Sargant: 'With great patience and clearness, through Bible-study, Scripture-memorizing, and song, he would give instruction which is remembered today by hundreds of semi-literate men, women, and children, to whom his teaching was the groundwork of their faith.' After all it was only a deep-based and intelligent faith which could prevent a sense of disillusionment when they discovered that the acceptance of Christ did not at once deliver them from economic bondage.

This almost ceaseless preaching meant that Tomlinson spent more than two hundred days a year on pilgrimage, sleeping in tents or humble inns, walking or travelling by bullock-cart and carrying the lantern which was an important

part of his equipment. Every evening he would hold a lantern-service for which the slides were carefully selected and the pictures considered in detail before he began to preach.

Such a life would not seem to provide much leisure for literary pursuits, but under these conditions he edited carefully the *Bōdhaka Bōdhini*, a magazine for preachers, whose title means *The Teacher's Teaching*. In addition to this regular work, he was continually writing tracts and pamphlets to assist in the work of evangelism. 'My Gospel for India', he said, 'is Christ's Gospel to me, living in India and thinking as far as I can as an Indian thinks.' The method and substance of his preaching was not primarily a destructive criticism of Hinduism, but rather a positive presentation of Christianity. His Christo-centric message was at once an example and reproof to all preachers. 'News without the name of Jesus is not the Good News,' he said, and practised what he preached.

Nor was he unwilling to learn new methods. From R. A. Hickling of the London Missionary Society he discovered the value of the song-service, and from his Indian colleague, K. Shadrach, he learned more than one new exposition of the parables! A typically oriental fatalism where sickness was concerned angered him, and he bitterly regretted his lack of medical knowledge.

This continuous teaching- and preaching-ministry in Mysore did not prevent his making valuable contributions to the work of the Christian Church as a whole. He will be remembered for his services on four occasions at the Maramon Convention in Travancore, and at the Basel Mission. His contribution to the revision of the Kanarese Bible culminated in supplying references to the books of the definitive Kanarese Bible, published in 1934. From 1925 to 1944 he was a member of the Joint Committee on Church Union in South India.

During his last seven years he was in charge of Kanarese literature at the Wesley Press, Mysore City, and edited the Kanarese weekly paper *Vrittanta Patrike*—the News-Sheet.

One would like to describe in closer detail such a many-coloured ministry, but this is so admirably done by Mr Sargant and Mr Ward from intimate personal knowledge, that it would be little short of an impertinence. We are deeply grateful for their sympathetic and informative study.

For our part we shall remember most vividly the picture of the old evangelist, Shadrach, preaching on the Prodigal Son, in an Indian village. The boy comes home and begins his prepared speech, but when he saw his father's hair—it was perfectly white—he could go no farther. Then Shadrach merged the story of the Prodigal Son into the story of the Cross. As Tomlinson described it all—to a Sunday-afternoon meeting of young people in an English manse—his voice became impassioned. He told them how, after the preaching, he walked down the village street. A man knelt by the roadside, praying: 'God help me to hate sin.'

That was the kind of result for which he lived and worked. That was the kind of result he got as he preached through the long years—gay and debonair, presenting a message of implacable Love, laughing at obstacles and setting his face steadfastly toward the unchanging goal. It was a full life, lived with modesty and courage, forgetful of earthly honours, and caring only for the Father's business—but it has left its mark on the people of Mysore.

JESUS AND HIS GOSPEL, SINCE SCHWEITZER¹

I

IN THE opening year of the present century there appeared in Germany a sketch of the life of Jesus² written by a young Alsatian named Albert Schweitzer (b. 1875). Its main idea had come to him some time earlier when at the age of 19 he was involved in his year of compulsory military service, and it was while he was reading Matthew 10-11 from the Greek Testament he carried in his knapsack that he discovered the apocalyptic key to the life of Jesus. J. Weiss in a short book in 1892³ had given substantially the same interpretation, but whereas he had dealt with the teaching of Jesus, Schweitzer tried to show that eschatology was the key to the events of His life also.

Little attention was paid to the sketch of 1901 and it did not appear in English until 1925. But in 1906 Schweitzer produced his great work *From Reimarus to Wrede*, brilliantly translated into English four years later by W. Montgomery under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. This was a work which could not be ignored and it soon aroused great debate, though more in this country than in Germany. It is true that R. H. Charles, with his unrivalled knowledge of apocalyptic literature, was not greatly impressed, and wrote in the preface to the second edition (1913) of his *Eschatology*:

Since Schweitzer's eschatological studies show no knowledge of original documents and hardly any of first-hand works on the documents, and since further they make no fresh contribution to the subject, no notice is taken of him in this edition.

Nevertheless the book created a furore in Oxford and Cambridge and was commended by Burkitt and Sanday, though the latter withdrew his support soon after.

The tremendous impact of this work was due partly to its dynamic presentation of Jesus, and also to the exciting way in which the research of the previous 150 years was set out. Nor ought we to forget the greatness of the author's own personality. Those moving words at the close about Christ coming to us as One unknown, with His call to discipleship—so difficult to reconcile with the main drift of the book—took on a new meaning when men saw Schweitzer abandoning his musical and academic career, embarking for equatorial Africa as a medical missionary, and himself seeking to be a 'channel of the power of Jesus'.

Since Schweitzer, every interpretation of the life and teaching of Jesus has had to reckon with the apocalyptic school. Half-way through the century is not a bad time to look back in order to trace the developments which have taken place in this field of study. No attempt will be made to enumerate or characterize the many lives of Jesus and accounts of His teaching which have appeared in the past fifty years; we shall look rather at the particular question which Schweitzer brought to the forefront, to see how it has been treated by certain representative writers, and how his interpretation has fared. The long

¹ Paper read at the Modern Churchmen's Conference (Cambridge, August 1950).

² *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis. Eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu* (1901). Eng. Trans., *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God* (1925).

³ *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*.

process of research which he claimed to have brought to its close still continues; and the question which he regarded as settled refuses to lie down. But first it is important to remember his main theme. It is concerned with Jesus' conception of the Kingdom of God. Jesus did not announce 'a kingdom that was to be founded and realized in the natural world by himself and the believers, but one that was to be expected as coming with the almost immediate dawn of a supernatural age'. This distinction is far more important than the handling of particular events. It is unnecessary at this time of day to point out that Synoptic study has shown that some of the eschatological material of the Gospels is secondary, and that after the researches of Hawkins and Streeter we cannot accept the discourse of Matthew 10 as 'historical as a whole and down to the smallest detail'. Without lingering with these and many similar matters, we should rather dwell upon this main point of *the character of the Kingdom of God*. There was, it is affirmed, nothing ethico-religious about it. Reimarus had seen that Jesus set out to be not a spiritual Saviour, but a political deliverer. Weiss's interpretation was simply Reimarus again 'with the signs changed', that is, with the apocalyptic Messiah instead of the political. 'A picture of the future is not spiritualized by being projected upon the clouds.' The eudemonistic aspirations have merely been transferred to a place of safety, to the transcendental region. This is the real thread of Schweitzer's work. He did not invent eschatology. His contribution stands or falls with the view that an expectation of the imminent end of the world provides the key to the teaching and life of Jesus.

II

The apocalyptic interpretation has had many supporters and one or two examples may be mentioned. The literary critic, J. Middleton Murry, in his beautifully written *Life of Jesus* (1926) presenting Him as man of genius, tells us that at His baptism He realized He was son of God, but it was a relationship open to all men. Later He found that His experience was unique and concluded that He was the Messiah; He was destined to be the Son of Man whose advent He had previously foretold. The cry of dereliction bears witness to the collapse of His hopes. It is impossible, says Murry, to understand the thought of our Lord unless we recognize that the Jews had abandoned belief in a Messiah who belonged to the order of humanity and expected the dramatic and spectacular advent of a transcendent figure. Like Schweitzer and many others, he takes it for granted that Jesus took over current Messianic expectations.

But when we ask for evidence to substantiate this familiar statement about Jewish beliefs, nothing really convincing can be produced. This point is worth dwelling upon for a moment. The apocalypses in general do not teach the Messiah's Parousia. The *Similitudes of Enoch* are exceptional, but it is by no means certain that they were in existence during our Lord's life. A number of scholars date them at a later period, and the reasons given by R. H. Charles for his dating are quite inconclusive, as I have shown elsewhere.⁴ Moreover, the Messiah's appearing in the *Similitudes* is different in important respects from the New Testament conception of the Second Advent, and the imagery of the latter

⁴ *The Second Advent: the Origin of the New Testament Doctrine* (1945), pp. 57ff.

is derived in every particular from Old Testament prophecies of the advent of God and the Day of the Lord. It appears that the Messiah's Parousia was not a current Jewish doctrine ready for Jesus to take over, and one of the eschatologists' initial assumptions falls to the ground.

One or two German scholars last century gave an exaggerated account of the importance of the apocalyptic writings and produced an impression that there was a general belief that an entirely transcendent Kingdom was to be inaugurated by a heavenly Messiah. G. Dalman⁶ protested against this, pointing out that some of the alleged evidence had been 'manufactured', and that a picture of the Messianic hope among the Jews in the time of Christ ought never to have been given in these terms. His words were not heeded and the Life-of-Jesus-Research has suffered in consequence. Schweitzer described the important work of Dalman and other Aramaic scholars as an 'episode in the general resistance to eschatology'.⁷

C. Guignebert in his *Jesus*⁷ admits, rightly, I think, that Jesus did not teach the doctrine of His own Parousia, but he holds that He expected the Kingdom of God to arrive very shortly by catastrophic action. When we consider the slender evidence by which this contention is supported, we cannot help feeling somewhat puzzled by the emphatic way in which it is put forward. The passages which Guignebert relies on are as follows: Mark 9¹ ('There be some here of them that stand by . . .')—a difficult saying whose meaning is by no means certain); Mark 13³⁰; Matthew 10²³; Luke 19¹¹, which merely states that they, i.e. either the disciples or the crowd, 'supposed that the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear'; and Mark 14²⁶ ('I will not any more drink of the fruit of the vine . . .'). These are quite unable to support the weight of the confident assumption which Guignebert rests upon them.

Goguel and Loisy are others who belong to the apocalyptic school. F. C. Burkitt's *Jesus Christ: an Historical Outline* (1932) takes a similar line, and even the conception of 'interim ethics' is accepted (p. 20). Future generations do not count, says Jesus in effect; the Kingdom of God is at hand, give to him that asks of you. . . .

It is difficult not to infer from the story in the early part of Mark that Jesus started with the belief 'that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear', while the rest of the Gospel may be read as putting before us some of the steps whereby Jesus came to realize that the time was not yet quite ripe, and to be persuaded that He must go up to Jerusalem and die there as the first condition for the coming of the New Age.

III

The view of the eschatologists means, of course, that Jesus was mistaken. In face of this serious difficulty, some have urged that as our Lord's knowledge was limited to the thought-forms of His own time we need not be greatly disturbed; others have explained the matter as a case of prophetic foreshortening. It may be pointed out, however, that we are not concerned with a mistake about a mere date, but about the very character of the Kingdom of God. The apocalyptic view means

⁶ *Die Worte Jesu* (1898). E. T., *The Words of Jesus* (1902), pp. 132, 248.

⁷ *Quest*, p. 289.

⁷ 1932; E. T. 1935.

that Jesus wholly misconceived God's method of action in history; that His emphasis was not on the moral and the spiritual, but on the supernatural in the sense of the miraculous; that He did not comprehend the meaning of His Cross, which stands as the boundary mark between two epochs of history and two conflicting interpretations of life . . . that He never dreamt of the dispensation of the Spirit. . . .⁸

In spite of the various explanations which scholars have put forward to show that a mistake of this kind does not really matter, it remains true that some people have abandoned the Christian faith on this issue, finding no bridge between the apocalyptic visionary and the Christ of the Church's worship. H. D. A. Major is surely right in saying that 'for many plain people Schweitzer's conclusions had a devastating effect on their Christian faith'.⁹

At the other extreme we have the 'crisis theologians' who welcome the interpretation of Schweitzer and his school, finding in it a vivid way of expressing the 'wholly other' character of the Kingdom. Thus R. Bultmann¹⁰ admits the mythological nature of the Parousia doctrine, but he finds the essential meaning of Jesus' message of the Kingdom in the conception of man which in the last analysis underlies it, the conception of man as forced to decision through a future act of God.

To this mythology belongs the expectation of the end of the world as occurring in time, the expectation which in the contemporary situation of Jesus is the natural expression of his conviction that even in the present, man stands in the crisis of decision, that the present is for him the last hour (p. 56).

Bultmann's book is affected by the excessive scepticism with which he treats the Gospel material, and this is connected with Form Criticism, which lies outside our immediate subject. While it has weakened our confidence in the sequence of events in the Gospels, it has no right to the final word on their historicity or on the genuineness of the sayings. Bultmann's opinion that Jesus did not believe Himself to be Messiah is sufficiently answered by W. Manson's *Jesus the Messiah* (1943).

Bultmann emphasizes the message of Jesus to such an extent that he appears to attach no importance to His person, and can even write the following:

By the tradition Jesus is named as bearer of the message; according to overwhelming probability he really was. Should it prove otherwise, that does not change in any way what is said in the record. I see then no objection to naming Jesus throughout as the speaker (p. 14).

Jesus is the bearer of God's word. But if the central place is to be given to God's claim and demand for obedience, one wonders why Christianity has been selected in this connexion; Islam would seem to lend itself more readily to this treatment. In any case, a message of this kind has more resemblance to the Law than the Gospel. Other 'crisis theologians' do not agree with this rather negative position, and E. Brunner, while describing the work as an important event, rightly says that the Marburg scholar 'sets the teaching of Jesus as the important thing over against His person, which is unimportant: he goes so far

⁸ H. Maldwyn Hughes, *The Kingdom of Heaven* (1922), p. 96.

⁹ *Civilization and Religious Values* (1948), p. 132.

¹⁰ *Jesus* (1926); E.T., *Jesus and the Word* (1935).

in this direction that he asserts his complete indifference to the question whether Jesus ever existed at all.¹¹

It has often been pointed out that the Kingdom is somehow inseparably connected with Jesus Himself. To follow Him is synonymous with entering the Kingdom. Anything which obscures this essential relation has missed one of the unique elements of the Christian religion. 'Who do men say that I am?' is still the vital question. 'What new thing did Jesus bring?' asks Irenaeus; and answers with the words: 'He brought Himself.'

If the Kingdom is thus closely associated with the person of Christ, so that in a sense it came when He came, some light is thrown on the question of a present Kingdom, a subject to which we now turn.

IV

Much attention has been given to those passages in which our Lord speaks of the Kingdom of God as something which is even now in the midst of men. 'If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you' (Luke 11²⁰). Such sayings, and there are many of them, would appear to be quite inconsistent with the view that Jesus expected the Kingdom to arrive catastrophically in the near future. They suggest rather that He reinterpreted the meaning of the Kingdom in a highly original way.

The eschatologists, however, take these passages to mean that the Kingdom is so near that already its powers are felt in the present. Schweitzer in explaining Weiss's view of a Kingdom that is wholly future writes:

It is present only as a cloud may be said to be present which throws its shadows upon the earth; its nearness, that is to say, is recognized by the paralysis of the Kingdom of Satan. . . . This is the only sense in which Jesus thinks of the Kingdom as present.¹²

When we examine the references to a present Kingdom it is very difficult to accept this interpretation. Look for example at Luke 10²³⁻⁴ ('Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see . . .'). These words surely speak of something that has already arrived. The disciples are not merely the last in a long series of those who waited and expected. Again, there are references to Satan having fallen from heaven, and to the strong man being bound. The goods of the strong man are being spoiled because he has already been mastered. Those who say this means merely that he is about to be overcome should attempt to despoil a burglar's lair two days before his approaching arrest; the experiment would, I think, have great expository value!

Jesus found the signs of the Kingdom's presence in His own ministry of healing and saving and preaching to the poor. The way in which this has been recognized in the period we are considering may be illustrated with one or two examples.

E. von Dobschütz in his *Eschatology of the Gospels* (1910), a series of lectures delivered at Oxford in 1909, showed that in the teaching of Jesus we have 'transmuted eschatology':

What was spoken of in Jewish eschatology as to come in the last days is taken here as already at hand in the lifetime of Jesus; it is transmuted at the same time in the other sense that what was expected as an external change is taken inwardly.¹³

¹¹ *The Mediator* (1927; E.T. 1934), p. 157.

¹² *Quest*, p. 238.

¹³ Page 150.

Similarly W. Manson in *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God* (1918):

Jesus regarded the new powers thus liberated in Himself for the overcoming of moral and physical evil as a definite indication of a new ingress of God in human life, marking a fresh era, and making all things new.¹⁴

The Gospel of Jesus, by presenting the Kingdom as something already cast like a seed into the ground, breaks through the moulds of apocalyptic thought, and diffuses itself in the world as a religion of realized redemption.¹⁵

T. W. Manson in his important work *The Teaching of Jesus* (1931) has rather a different way of explaining the presence of the Kingdom. Taking the expression in a collective sense, he maintains that Jesus' mission was to create 'the Son of Man', the Kingdom of the saints of the Most High. First He appeals to the people and then, when this appeal produces no adequate response, He consolidates His own band of followers. Finally, 'when it becomes apparent that not even the disciples are ready to rise to the demands of the ideal, he stands alone, embodying in his own person the perfect human response to the regal claims of God'.

The last part of the way He travels alone; and at the cross He alone is the Son of Man, the incarnation of the Kingdom of God on earth. The Son of Man is rejected and slain. That ought to be the end of the story; but it is not. The suffering and death of Jesus are the birth-pangs of the Son of Man. The cross proves to be the key that opens the Kingdom of God to men.¹⁶

This connexion of the Kingdom with the Cross has been noticed by a number of writers. It helps to explain some of the forward-looking references to the Kingdom, and such a saying as Luke 12⁴⁹⁻⁵⁰ where

Jesus implies that He is subject as yet to conditions that imprison and fetter Him. He cannot move at freedom till He has undergone His baptism; and He looks forward to it with passionate eagerness as to the great event which will mark the beginning of His true activity.¹⁷

We can thus understand that although the Kingdom is present in the ministry of Jesus, it is present only in its initial stages; its full coming, its coming with power, lies on the other side of the Cross. 'He believed His death to be a necessary step to the establishment of the Kingdom.'¹⁸

According to R. Otto's *Kingdom of God and Son of Man* (1934; E.T. 1938) the Kingdom in the thought of Jesus 'still awaits its full revelation, but in its preliminary dawning it is already present as a power effective in advance'.¹⁹ So strongly has Otto emphasized the Kingdom as a present reality that he is sometimes classed as holding a system of 'realized eschatology'; but he makes it plain that in his view 'the Kingdom of God was for Christ always the future Kingdom of the new age and was conceived on strict eschatological terms'. But already its powers had penetrated into the world. Otto's contention that 'Jesus lived in the ideas of Enoch's apocalyptic tradition' has not won wide acceptance.

The phrase 'realized eschatology' is specially identified with C. H. Dodd,

¹⁴ Page 84.

¹⁵ Page 97.

¹⁶ Page 235.

¹⁷ E. F. Scott, *The Kingdom and the Messiah* (1911), p. 229.

¹⁸ Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice* (1929), pp. 141-2.

¹⁹ E.T., p. 109.

who has developed the conception in a series of works. Particular mention may be made of his *Parables of the Kingdom* (1935).²⁰ The parables are seen in their original setting in the life of Jesus and related to a Kingdom which has already arrived; 'the "eschatological" Kingdom of God is proclaimed as a present fact, which men must recognize, whether by their actions they accept or reject it'.²¹

It should in fairness be mentioned that one or two of those referred to in this section while rejecting 'consistent eschatology' nevertheless believe that Jesus did expect to return before the end of that generation. Thus Dobschütz admitted that Jesus retained some eschatological conceptions which cannot be included among those which He 'transmuted'. It was in this way alone that He could imagine final success. The hope was mistaken, but the spiritual conviction it expressed holds good, and we still have the main body of His teaching which is not eschatological in any sense. This is a very common point of view.

v

In the light of the foregoing there is some justification for describing the past fifty years as showing 'The Breakdown of Consistent Eschatology'. The same result is apparent if we consider the relations of our Lord with the Jewish nation. Schweitzer, following Reimarus, said that 'Jesus was a Jew and had no intention of founding a new religion. He also affirmed that Jesus did not foresee the destruction of Jerusalem'.²² Both these points were vital to his eschatological scheme. J. Klausner, the Jewish scholar, in his *Jesus of Nazareth*,²³ agreed that it did not enter the mind of Jesus to form a new religion and proclaim it outside the Jewish nation. Jesus may have unconsciously given a certain impetus toward a new religion by exaggerating His own relationship to God and by His extreme emphasis on ethics, but it was due to 'reasons and causes outside of Jesus' that a new religion branched off from the community of Israel and spread among the Gentiles. These other causes are explained in Klausner's *From Jesus to Paul*.²⁴

It is true that the New Testament does not speak of Christianity as 'a new religion'. The Church was continuous with Israel as 'the people of God'. But this does not warrant us in saying that Jesus had no thought of altering the ways of Judaism. There is definite evidence that the new era of the Kingdom of God inaugurated by His ministry held far-reaching changes. The references to the new patch on the old garment, to new wine and the old wine-skins, show that in the thought of Jesus something new had arrived which could not be accommodated within the existing framework. 'The law and the prophets were until John; from that time the gospel of the Kingdom of God is preached.'

It may be that our Lord first hoped that the nation as a whole would respond to His message. This has been argued by C. J. Cadoux in his well-documented study, *The Historic Mission of Jesus* (1941). Jesus, he maintains, advocated a policy of reconciliation with Rome. When it became clear that the nation was not responding, He changed His plans and envisaged the future of the Kingdom

²⁰ See also his brief but invaluable summary 'The Life and Teaching of Jesus Christ' in T. W. Manson's *Companion to the Bible* (1939), pp. 367ff.

²¹ *Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 44. ²² *Quest*, p. 231. ²³ 1922; E.T. 1925. ²⁴ 1939; E.T. 1944.

in a very different way. He foresaw, among other things, a collapse of the nation's life resulting from a revolt against Rome, a revolt He had sought to avert. There was a causal connexion between the rejection of His ethic of love and the calamity of A.D. 70.

If Jesus foresaw the fall of the old Israel, and there is good evidence that He did,²⁵ did He regard His own disciples as the nucleus of a new Israel, a Remnant? Cadoux does not follow this line of thought, but a number of others have done so. The withdrawal of our Lord from the multitude, who could not grasp 'the mystery of the Kingdom', and His concentration upon the training of His disciples, are more than compatible with the view that He had in mind the creation of a new fellowship. J. W. Bowman of Pennsylvania in his thoughtful work *The Intention of Jesus* (1945) holds that the very choice of twelve disciples was an acted parable which showed that 'of this typical Remnant he would raise up a new congregation of Israel to displace the old one'.²⁶ He concludes that 'Jesus appears to have aimed at the setting up of a definitive group in which the Kingdom ethic should find realization'. This reference to the moral teaching is interesting, because others have been led by a study of this to the idea of a new community. Few would today support the idea of 'interim ethics', and it is clear that the teaching on love of God and one's neighbour, prayer, sincerity, meekness, industry, reconciliation, has no connexion with a limited amount of time.

The moral standard set up by Jesus (writes T. W. Manson) is to be conceived as given to the New Israel—the community of His followers— . . . to be the charter of their existence as a people of God. Entrance into the Kingdom or discipleship—they come to much the same thing—involves acceptance of the way of life which Jesus teaches and exemplifies.

The Kingdom on earth manifests itself as the society of all those who follow the Messiah and take upon themselves the yoke which He bears.²⁷

One of the most surprising developments of recent years is the way in which from various approaches we are led back to the conception of the Church. The eschatologists told us most emphatically that nothing can have been farther from our Lord's mind. Jesus, says M. Goguel,²⁸ was too much dominated by the idea of the immediate end of the existing order to trouble about such things as the future of His disciples. But the words at the Last Supper alone suggest a different conclusion.

According to Jewish thought, a new covenant with God implied and constituted a new religious community—a new Israel. Even were there no other evidence, this fact by itself would be almost sufficient to prove that the Christian Church was no mere result of the force of circumstances after Christ's death, but that, when He so impressively invited His disciples to enter into a new covenant with God sealed by His blood, He was consciously and with full purpose founding a new community.²⁹

K. L. Schmidt, the critic who 'shattered' the Synoptic outline, writes that 'the question whether Jesus made His disciples into an "ecclesia" must be

²⁵ See C. J. Cadoux, op. cit., pp. 266ff.

²⁶ Page 185.

²⁷ *Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 295, 211.

²⁸ *Jesus the Nazarene; Myth or History?* (1925; E.T. 1926), p. 242.

²⁹ A. G. Hogg, *Christ's Message of the Kingdom* (1911), p. 214.

answered in the affirmative'.³⁰ R. Newton Flew in *Jesus and His Church* (1938) demonstrates by a five-fold argument that Jesus 'had in view a community of a new kind'.³¹

Years ago Loisy declared that 'Jesus foretold the Kingdom, and it was the Church that came'.³² This is really an astonishing remark, if it implies that the Church was an undesigned accident. When we have on one hand Jesus speaking of some great developments which will follow upon His death, and on the other side we have the Church conscious of a new divine power streaming from a living Lord, it is hard to believe that He expected something entirely different. Jesus says to the disciples: 'Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.' Later we find the Christian community with these same men at its heart rejoicing in a present Kingdom of righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit. Jesus speaks of a Kingdom which is present in embryonic form, a seed destined to grow into a tree, a Kingdom which is shortly to come with power. Later we find the Church in possession of a Kingdom which has a sense of divine power as one of its main characteristics; 'the Kingdom of God is not in word but in power' (1 Corinthians 4²⁰).

VI

Recent trends thus suggest a decisive answer to our original question about the character of the Kingdom of God. There is no doubt at all that the early Church thought of itself as living within the new age. The early Christians without question reinterpreted the conception of the Kingdom; the only point at issue is whether this reinterpretation was foreshadowed by our Lord. Is it credible that He held to the view of a Kingdom to be established by divine catastrophe and that it was His followers who evolved ideas of such force and originality? Sir Edwyn Hoskyns discusses this question in his *Cambridge Sermons* (1938). He shows that Paul, John and Luke find in the coming of the Spirit and in the Christian fellowship the fulfilment of the promises of God. Then he goes on to ask what our Lord Himself meant. 'Is this Pauline, Lucan, Johannine interpretation of our Lord's teaching really justifiable?'

Is His language about the End and about the Kingdom of God capable of such an interpretation? There can, I venture to suggest to you, be no real doubt as to our answer. Our Lord's eschatological language, as indeed all His teaching and actions, was mainly symbolical. To speak humanly, He felt Himself standing on the brink of a new spiritual order, an order which was to come into being as a direct result of His life and death, and which was to be the fulfilment of the longings of the greatest of the Jewish prophets. To express this Gospel He used the traditional language of Jewish expectation of the End, since it provided Him with a vehicle to express the significance of His life and death.³³

This interpretation does not of course (as Hoskyns saw) absorb all the eschatological teaching of the Gospels by any means. Great confusion has been caused by a certain ambiguity in the meaning of the word 'eschatology'. Strictly it means the doctrine of the last things, and the four traditional last things are

³⁰ Quoted in Brunner, op. cit., p. 425 (E.T.).

³¹ Page 48.

³² *The Gospel and the Church* (1902; E.T., 1908), p. 166.

³³ Hoskyns, op. cit., pp. 31-2.

death, judgement, heaven, and hell. But the word is sometimes used in connexion with the Messianic time; it would have been much better if the word 'Messianic' had been used for this special sense of 'eschatological'.

The past fifty years have thus in one way witnessed a return to earlier views. We have had to descend from the dizzy apocalyptic heights; but while our journey was not really necessary, we have had the benefit of the view and we descend to the sober plain with a clearer understanding of its contours. We see in a more vivid way that the coming of Christ marks a new era; we have a more dynamic conception of His life and work. We are not returning to the view popular fifty years ago of the Kingdom of God as a glorified moral rearmament campaign, but we understand it in terms of the action of God Himself. And as a result we have a new appreciation of the unity of the New Testament. Gospels and Epistles alike announce that God was in Christ taking action for the salvation of men.

The fragments of Reimarus were issued with the title: *The Aim of Jesus and His Disciples*. This is the theme we need to consider just as seriously as the meaning of isolated texts. What was the intention of Jesus; the controlling purpose of His activity? In answering this question we are led to the fact that Jesus reinterpreted not only the Kingdom, but also the Messiahship, combining this office with the prophecies of the Suffering Servant. In the Temptation do we not see Him working out the methods of His Messiahship? (Incidentally it is significant that the Temptation story, in which Dostoevsky and others have found such profound meanings, is dismissed by Schweitzer as unhistorical.) He refuses to bribe men with social alleviation, rejects the ways of domination and supernatural display. He will establish His sovereignty by choosing the path of obedience and service. So it is through the whole story.

His aim is nothing less than the kingdoms of the world, but He will win them by the methods of sacrificial love. As He faces the Cross He sees beyond it the fulfilment of Daniel's vision of one like unto a son of man who comes to the Ancient of Days,

and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

THE THEOLOGY OF MISSIONS

The Contribution of P. T. Forsyth

IN RECENT days renewed interest has centred round the teaching of Dr P. T. Forsyth and emphasis has been placed upon his theology of the Cross. He was indeed no mere 'schoolman', but rather a prophet, speaking the Word of the Lord with a sense of urgency and need. As we turn to his writings we find his unique emphasis applied to every problem. Whether he is writing on preaching, on the sacraments, on the future life, or on the ethics of marriage, the Cross is always central and decisive.

We are not surprised, therefore, to find this emphasis in his treatment of the missionary question. It stands forth most clearly in a remarkable sermon preached at the City Temple on behalf of the London Missionary Society:¹

The great and real charter of Missions, therefore, lies not in any express command of Christ. They would be just as binding on us if the command at the close of Matthew's Gospel had dropped off with the last page of the first manuscript. They would arise, as they did for Paul, not out of any injunction, but out of the nature of Christ's Person and especially from His Cross, His Resurrection, and His exalted life, judgement, and reign. . . . If they had not been commanded by Christ they would have been invented by His Holy Spirit. . . . They are a dispensation of the Spirit. So entirely are missions supernatural in their nature that they must rise and fall with our faith in the supernatural, with the reality of the Cross to us, and of the resurrection, and of our relations with the living Christ. Our missions will escape from chronic difficulties when our Church recovers the ruling note of the redeeming Cross and the accent of the Holy Ghost.

These words uttered over forty years ago are as relevant today as then. Indeed they give the key to all effective missionary work down the ages. The mainspring has always been a realization of the redeeming work of Christ.

It is not pity, but faith; not so much pity for perishing heathen, but faith and zeal for Christ's crown rights set up for ever in the deed decisive for all the world.

This comes home to us in a personal way. 'You may always measure the value to yourself of Christ's Cross by your interest in missions. And it is a safe test of the Spirit's presence in a Church.'

So also for the missionary, while these great fundamental truths may not be 'the missionary's stock in trade', they are always his 'capital and inspiration'. It is the Cross as something even more than inspiration that supplies the missionary motive. It is essentially *the Cross as judgement*. As Forsyth points out, while missions a hundred years ago were based, so the critics say, on the passion to save the heathen from Hell, or in other words on *eschatological* rather than *ethical* motive, yet the principle was not essentially wrong. There is a great judgement in the Cross of Christ. Christ crucified judged the world, and so the world is adjudged to Christ. The judgement at the end of history is only the corollary of the judgement at the centre of history. 'The more completely we feel sin to be condemned in the Cross, the more power and

¹ Printed along with other missionary utterance in the volume *Missions in State and Church* (H. & S., 1908).

commandment we have to carry the absolution to the ends of the earth.'

Emphasizing the truth that the great Reformers, although they did not prosecute missions, yet prepared the way for them, Forsyth points out that Protestant Missions were not the product of shallow liberalism nor humanitarian sympathy, but of 'an evangelical faith largely on Calvinistic lines'. The apparent contradiction here is explained in that the breadth of the Gospel really springs from its depth.

I would venture to say that missions have more to hope for from a narrow creed which remains great than from a wide humanism that runs thin. The Spirit of Unitarianism, whether open and acknowledged or hidden and denied sends forth no missionaries because it has no Gospel. We cannot rest missions on a religion of mere Fatherhood alone. One source of the decay in missionary interest is the decay in theological perception and conviction. . . . Our missionary work reveals the difference between Unitarianism and ourselves to be very real. It lies in the very thing which made the Church, by making Christianity a mission. It lies in the Son's Cross and in its deep Divinity. . . . The secret of Godhead is in the gospel of Atonement and of Fatherhood by Holy Death.

A second great truth that Forsyth emphasizes in his missionary utterances, is that the Cross is not only *the key to the message* but *the secret of the method*. It is the very pattern on which the true missionary works, and by which alone the missionary cause can truly advance.

Is it a strange thing then, that missionaries should daily die as other men do not? . . . They are specially delivered unto death. You cannot separate the Mission and the Passion in a universal Christianity. There is no World crown without the Cross. The Church that missions really dies with Christ, and its missionaries but show forth its death. . . . Neither can we save the heathen but by dying for them one way or another. Chalmers says it, and Stonehouse, and many a voice from beneath the altar and behind the veil. There is nothing finer or more pathetic to me than the way in which missionaries unlearn the love of the old home, die to their native land, and wed their hearts to the people they have served and won; so that they cannot rest in England, but must return to lay their bones where they spent their hearts for Christ. How vulgar and common patriotisms seem beside this inverted home-sickness, this passion for a kingdom which has no frontiers and no favoured race, the passion of a homeless Christ.

In powerful and moving language, Dr Forsyth calls up the pageant of missionary heroism and sacrifice down the ages. We cannot forbear to quote again:

There is no more heroic region of human valour. There is not in army or navy a focus of such bravery as each mission-house shows. There are no deeds that won our Empire so stirring to good blood as the exploits of Christ's kingdom in new lands. There are no fortitudes so long, strong, and silent, as those which underlie the early Christianity of a new race. Take Africa alone. In the eighteenth century the Moravians lost all their twelve missionaries on the West coast. The Wesleyans followed them and lost sixty-three men in fifty years. The Basle Society lost in the same time twenty-nine men out of one hundred and seven. The American Society has lost, since 1874, fifty-four out of ninety. In Surinam, out of three hundred and ten missionaries one hundred and thirty-four succumbed in less than a century to the awful climate. And so on.

The missionary has learnt the Gospel in the school of experience. He daily *lives* the word of the Cross. He knows the language of suffering and speaks it in his daily manner of life. Emphasizing this truth Forsyth brings in a personal note.

I cannot remember since boyhood passing a day without pain; but I think my life a piece of disheartening self-indulgence when I read missionary biography and track its quavering red line of apostolic succession from the beginning until now. . . . In about ten years from 1876 the London Missionary Society lost in Central Africa ten men, and nine had to retire—all out of twenty-three. Yet the Directors solemnly resolved 'to prosecute the mission with greater earnestness than ever'. This was courage of the missionaries' own kind, and the bold strategy, the audacious prudence of the Holy Ghost, such as the true-born soldier loves. It is the large, exalted, anointed recklessness that took Christ to the Cross and won the world. And it is courage in the face of fearful odds such as the British race should love. What is our pittance of money, our fits of sympathy, beside long, lonely devotions like these multiplied over the earth? Their voices haunt us from graves baking in African suns or soaking in malarial swamps, or watched by the lion or the lizard that cannot break their sleep. They demand that we shall not let their work be wasted, or their blood be like water spilt upon the ground, or their quiet resolve choked in the dust that stops their mouths. This work has cost too much to fail now. And it is a sacred investment that we can only save by investing more.

Yet another insight relevant to the present situation is the *vital necessity for missionary work*. Missions are more than a hobby of some interested enthusiasts, they are but the fulfilment of a debt. This truth is brought out in a striking sermon on Romans 1⁴.² Here Forsyth lets himself go with characteristic pungency, speaking of this apostolic word as 'a hard saying for the Englishman whose frame of mind, ingrained for centuries, is: "I am Creditor to all the World."' Missions are *voluntary* and yet they imply *obligation* according to the highest standards.

Where the Spirit of the Cross is, there is the pressure of Spiritual debt and Christian chivalry. . . . Missions are compulsory in a Church by its own high law, if it is to remain a Church. By the law of spiritual life the mission-less Church betrays that it is a Cross-less Church: and it becomes a faithless Church, a mere religious society, and finally perhaps a mere cultured clique.

It follows therefore that missions are not an *accident* of the Church's life, but belong to its *essence*. A Church may be neutral in politics but it cannot be so in missionary activity. So with the individual believer, missionary interest is not optional. 'You are bound by your Christianity, . . . not to be interested would be to confess that you did not understand your own creed.'

The whole point is that we are debtors. As Forsyth bluntly puts it: 'The man who repudiates his debts is bankrupt; the Church that disavows missionary sympathy is bankrupt in evangelical grace and universal faith. The decay of evangelical faith is fatal to missions.' Missions are also 'a debt on the Church by way of amends, not only because of what Christ had done for it, but because of what it has done against Christ.' This is aptly illustrated from the tragic story of South America; had South America received the same Christianity as

² *Missions in State and Church*, pp. 249-74.

North, Christ and the world would have been richer today. Even in Europe the persecuting spirit of the Church, its greed of plunder and lust of power in bygone centuries, makes true missionary witness difficult to this day. Yet missionary work, evangelical, spiritual, and sacrificial, is the only answer. In Africa and elsewhere it is only by wholehearted missionary service that we can make some late amends for the exploitation and demoralization of native people in the interest of Western trade and 'Civilization'. Forsyth's words concerning India are significant:

No Christianizing of our policy can dispense with missionary effort in the more direct and special sense. And in the case of India, perhaps our Christian policy in preparing difficulties for us and dangers, which can only be met by the subjection of the Hindoos as individuals to the control of the gospel. We have plied them with the literature of public liberty, without preparing them, as Puritanism prepared us by the influences of moral liberty. If we give a Christian emancipation without bestowing that inward Christian freedom which alone can safely manage enfranchisement, we may only be preparing for India revolution, anarchy, and new despotisms.

This like much else in Forsyth's writing has a truly prophetic note about it. He had such a grasp of the fundamental truths of the Eternal Gospel that everything he wrote manifests a note of insight and discernment that passes by the incidental and lays hold of the fundamental. Living before the age of world-crisis in which we find ourselves, he knew that all life in the light of Calvary must be interpreted in terms of crisis. For the Christian Church every age brings it to the cross-roads, and in no sphere is this more evident than in that of its missionary enterprise. Let our final quotation then be yet another word concerning the *essential missionary nature* of true Christianity.

The power that claims and saves us is beyond history, from before the foundation of the world. The first missionary was God the Father, who sent forth His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh. That is the seal and final ground of missions—the grace, the ultimate, unbought, overwhelming grace of God, the eternal heart and purpose of the Father who gave us not only a prophet but a propitiation. The second missionary was the Son, the apostle of our profession as the New Testament calls Him, the true primate of the apostles, of those that He sent forth from the bosom of the Father to declare Him; who exiled and emptied Himself in this foreign land of earth, and 'humbled Himself to death, even the death of the Cross'. And the third missionary is the Holy Ghost, whom the Saviour sends forth into all the earth, who comes mightily and sweetly ordering all things, and subduing all lands to the obedience and kingdom of Christ. And the fourth missionary is the Church. And these four missionaries are all involved in the one Divine redemption to which we owe ourselves utterly, which is the ground of the divinest claims on us, and makes us debtors, and nothing but debtors, for ever and ever. These go forth into each other, into all the world, into the depths of the soul. And the soul is saved in going forth from itself into this one living fellowship and through it in love, sacrifice, and blessing to all the world.

D. W. LAMBERT

ŚRĪ AUROBINDO (1872-1950)

I BEGIN to write this article on 6th December 1950. Last night's paper here in Madras carried news of the Korean War at a most critical stage, and of the first meeting of President Truman and Mr Attlee in a conference which the world is watching with bated breath—yet the news of these things was almost crowded off the front page, in favour of the news of the death early that morning of Śrī Aurobindo Ghose, the writer, philosopher, and sage. As on 7th December I revise what I had written, I read that his burial service—for he is to be buried, though a Hindu—has been postponed for two days by the help of an unexplained preservation of the body, and that a continuous stream of tens of thousands of pilgrims are filing past it—and this, it must be remembered, in a rather inaccessible minor town, and in the tropics, where funerals have normally to be within thirty-six hours of death. In Calcutta, his birth-place, when the news of his death reached it, the whole of that great town—the second largest in the Commonwealth—shut up business for the day. Will England be quite so moved when either the Archbishop of Canterbury or Earl Russell passes away? Undoubtedly Śrī Aurobindo was, after Paṇḍit Nehru, the greatest figure in the new India—and this in virtue of purely intellectual and spiritual pre-eminence.

He was born in 1872. His father insisted on his having a purely Western education, and sent him to St Paul's School and King's College, Cambridge—strange preparation for one who was to become a nationalist agitator and later the chief reinterpreter of India's ancient wisdom. In this education he was brilliantly successful. He passed high in the written examinations for the Indian Civil Service. He was a good scholar in Latin, Greek, German, and Italian, and moved with lordly ease through French and English literature. In later life his thought moved mainly in Sanskrit; but the effects of his English education remained. In his own output he became one of the greatest English prose-writers of our day, and his English poetry was much in the style of and not inferior in quality to that of Swinburne.

But his mind was not at ease in this environment. He refused to take the riding examination for the Indian Civil Service, and so gained no appointment. He returned to India, and for thirteen years worked in the State of Baroda, as Private Secretary to the Mahārājā and later as Vice-Principal of the Baroda College. But still he had not found himself. In 1906 he threw up this career to return to Bengal in order to enter into the nationalist movement, then centring in Bengal, in the agitation against Lord Curzon's partition of that Province. This was a movement in which many of the greatest Indians of the day found their life-work, and in which even a Mahātmā like Gāndhiji found his soul's peace. But that was not to be the way for Aurobindo: he was a politician for only four years. During a year's imprisonment in 1908 he had received a vision of Lord Kṛṣṇa calling him to lead his nation in a revival of the Hindu religion and culture (*dharma*). In response to that call, he retired in 1910 to Pondichéry, a little enclave of French territory on the south-eastern coast of the Indian peninsula, where he was free from political suspicion. Thenceforth he made occasional political pronouncements—notably when he

urged support of the Allies in the Second World War—but took no further active part in politics.

In Pondichéry he found his life-work. There he settled down and deeply studied that traditional *yoga* with which he had had little but amateur acquaintance before: he organized his *āśrama* and wrote his great series of philosophical books, notably the 1,300 pages of *The Life Divine*. He never left Pondichéry; indeed for many years toward the end of his life he never left his house, and even left one room only three times a year, when he sat on his balcony and gave silent *darśan* (audience) to tens of thousands of devotees who crowded into Pondichéry for these occasions, and even in his room he saw and spoke to no one but 'the Mother'. ('The Mother' is a Frenchwoman, an adept in *yoga*, who was regrettably given a cosmic significance in his philosophy; she has been for many years a most competent business manager of the *āśrama* and of its head.) There can be no doubt that his personal sanctity was such that these silent showings of himself, and the more personal but still indirect contacts with his disciples in the *āśrama*, have brought peace and depth to very many lives.

The direct effect of his sanctity cannot long survive his death; and as a literary figure, though I should say he might rank as high as Swinburne in poetry and as Bradley in prose-writing, I do not think he could rank higher than that. It is as a philosopher that he will live.

In one sense this is strange, since there is practically nothing original in his philosophy. But Hindu philosophy, it must be remembered, fulfils the functions which in the West are so regrettably divided between philosophy and theology. And who wants an original theologian? The great virtue of a theologian is to be a great expositor of revealed truth. So it is with Indian philosophy. The touchstone of greatness there is not: Has this man a new insight? but: Has this man mastered the old insight with his own mind and with his own whole spiritual being? As such, Śrī Aurobindo was far supreme over all other modern Indian thinkers, and perhaps on a level with their great sages of the past.

Śrī Aurobindo's philosophy, then, is simply *Vedāntic* Hinduism—what we in the West call Absolutism, if it be carefully remembered that (a) in India the philosophy of this position and the religion of this position are not severed, and that (b) the proper translation of the key-word '*māyā*' used of the mode of being of the phenomenal world is not 'illusion', possibly not even 'appearance', but rather 'lower reality' or 'becoming'. Śrī Aurobindo defended all parts of this classical creed, including even the doctrine of *karma* and its corollary of reincarnation, which nearly always jars on Western minds as undesirable and dogmatic.

In some ways it could be held that Śrī Aurobindo gave a new interpretation to this doctrine, by treating it activistically, and not—as the West, rightly or wrongly, generally conceives of Indian mysticism—as a world-flight. In his hands it is a means of enjoyment and service in the world: the universe is not a regrettable accident of the Divine Nature, but an outpouring of His life in 'evolution', in order that in 'involution' (both personal and cosmic) it may be taken up again into His life and enrich it. This is clearly a profounder doctrine of creation than much popular thought both in the East and the West achieves; and perhaps it owes something of its form to Western evolutionism. But even

this was in Śrī Aurobindo's own view merely an exposition of the Indian doctrine of the *Vedas* and the older *Upaniṣads* and the *Gītā*, freed from later accretions made by inferior spirits. In any case he had been anticipated in this activism by the Rāmakrishna Mission under Swāmī Vivekānanda. (Perhaps, however, Aurobindo would have accepted personal responsibility for the details of the evolution and involution through a series of stages for which there seems very little evidence, and whose exposition forms probably the weakest part of his thought.)

An outer reflection of this inner system is the life of his community at Pondichéry. It is a community of Spiritual aspirants. Everyone there is there as a deliberate seeker after a higher spiritual state. Some of them are celibate, and purely 'contemplatives': others live in groups, or even in families, and do ordinary work—in the *āśrama's* admirable Press, or in its bakery, or in the gardens, and so on. Three things are common to them all—the complete cleanliness of their persons and abodes, the simplicity and yet beauty of all their buildings, and the cheerful serenity of their faces. The present writer has lived much with religious folk of various creeds, and has seen something of community life among them; but he has never seen so impressive a group-witness to the charm and power of religion as when a few years ago he was privileged by the kindness of friends there, and by the courteous permission of 'the Mother', to visit the Śrī Aurobindo *āśrama* for some days.

A body of writings like Śrī Aurobindo's,¹ and an associated quality of life like his *āśrama's*, is a theological challenge to us Christians. We expound our theologies and philosophies; and in so doing we may, if our tastes or duties take us that way, include quite neat refutations of popular Hinduism (an easy thing), or of some aspects of *Vedāntic* Hinduism like Dr Rādhākṛishnan's (not too hard a thing); but have we yet really got to grips with a matured and balanced system like Śrī Aurobindo's? The heart of our Gospel is the historic action of God in Christ. We can expound that well enough to brush aside the superstitions of the queer divine doings of fable; we can expound it well enough to expose the inadequacy of rationalist or theosophist or unitarian syncretisms; but faced with a deep, happy, activist form like Śrī Aurobindo's we need much more stringent thinking and careful phrasing than we usually achieve. And, after one has seen the clean, useful, joyous life of his community, one can scarcely be so careless as one used to be in the statement of the Christian doctrine of salvation.

JOHN F. BUTLER

¹ His books, published in India, may not be easy to obtain in England. The Society I serve, the Christian Literature Society for India (a branch of the United Society for Christian Literature) (address—The C.L.S., P.O. Box 501, Park Town, Madras 3, South India), would be pleased to arrange supplies on order.

WILFRED MONOD (1867-1943)

THE REFORMED CHURCH of France passed through great tribulations during the earlier years of its existence. Persecutions so severe and so prolonged that in comparison the 'Killing Time' of the Scottish Covenanters seems but a transient episode, tended to give the Huguenots a sombre view of the world, and accentuated the sterner features of their Calvinistic theology. But with the removal of ecclesiastical and political restrictions a milder strain manifested itself; and the infiltration of Methodism, with its warm-hearted evangelism, brought a more hopeful view of human nature. Hence there arose during the nineteenth century, a liberal evangelical movement, which has continued until the present day. And prominent among its representatives was the devout humanist, Pastor Wilfred Monod.

Fortunately we have Wilfred Monod's own account of himself in his charming autobiography, *Après la Journée*, published in 1938, just after his seventieth birthday; and from it we are able to trace the course of his life and development. Born in Paris in 1867, he came of a race of pastors. His great-uncle, Adolphe Monod, the famous preacher, has been called 'the Protestant Bossuet'. His grandfather Frédéric had founded the Free Churches, under the influence of Methodism, which initiated the French *Réveil* of the first part of the nineteenth century. Wilfred's father first studied law in Paris. Then he exercised a ministry among the Free Churches before joining the National Reformed Church. Later he became pastor of the Oratoire of the Louvre in Paris. He preached with equal facility in English and French, and was in much request at revival and sanctification assemblies in Great Britain. Although an evangelical of the old school, he was on amicable terms with well-known adherents of the liberal theology, which did not hinder him from being himself. Without irony and yet not without humour he said to his friend, the modernist and social reformer, Charles Wagner: 'Your ceiling is my floor.' On passing the statue of Pascal at the Tour St-Jacques he reverently raised his hat; and on his death-bed he asked for a copy of La Fontaine's *Fables*.

Wilfred's mother, the daughter of a well-known Paris doctor who was also a fervent Christian, won the adoring affection of her children. She died when he was still young; but her gentle, gracious spirit made an ineffaceable impression on him. It was to her he confided his first religious vow.

'One evening', he wrote, 'before I went to sleep, my mother came to my little bed, and I said to her simply and without the least hesitation: "Mamma, I gave my heart to God today." If she had made the least objection or shown the least doubt, or asked a single question in a tone of surprise, the fine, serene certainty in which my soul was expanding would have received a check. But without raising her voice she replied in a natural but grave tone: "Thank God!" She kissed me more tenderly than usual, and when she stole silently away I went to sleep peaceably in the dark, my soul bathed in light. My spirit, raised above fear and freed from death, came into touch with the very heart of the universe. Never after that did I lose contact with the Eternal.'

After the death of Wilfred's mother his father married again; and the same loving care was shown by his stepmother. His maternal grand-parents, who

lived in the same house, lavished on him the tenderness they had shown for their only daughter. He responded to their affection with an absolute confidence. The atmosphere in which he grew was singularly free from harshness, partisan passion, and hatred of race or class. He could not tell when he first felt his vocation to the pastorate, but he said afterwards that 'he entered the ministry like a ship coming into port'. After attending the École Alsacienne and the Lycée, he entered the Sorbonne, where he took his Licencié in Philosophy. Later he stayed at Cassel to learn German, and later still he went to Berlin, where he attended a course of lectures by Adolph Harnack. Besides visiting several European countries he went to the United States for the Bible-course founded at Northfield by D. L. Moody. When he came to Britain for a Pan-Presbyterian Congress a fellow-traveller in the train to Edinburgh happened to discover his family name.

"You are a son of Théodore Monod," he said, "and the grand-nephew of Adolphe Monod? Then you must preach in my parish church next Sunday. Our minister is on holiday." "But", I objected, "I can't preach in English. You can tell that by my accent." "On the contrary," he replied, "it will be an added charm and attraction." I objected in vain. The following Sunday I preached at Jedburgh; and on the Monday my host as a sign of gratitude took me to his mill and made me choose an "everlasting" plaid, which ever afterwards rendered me loyal service.'

In November 1888 Wilfred Monod went to Montauban for his theological training. His first contact with a school of future ministers gave him a shock 'like a liner striking an iceberg'. The rather rough pranks played upon freshmen, the noisy revellings, troubled and sometimes scandalized him. He determined to resist these tendencies, and he drew up for himself a strict code of rules and principles. He confessed afterwards that these were 'rather Jansenist'; and indeed he could see the comic side of things as well as anybody, and enjoyed a hearty laugh. But his reaction against the life of the college went deeper. Those were the days of the Concordat régime, and some of the students seemed to have entered the ministry for purely professional reasons, without having any sense of the urgency of their calling. He became leader of a movement for reviving what he considered to be the true spirit of the pastorate; and in collaboration with two others issued two brochures on the subject dedicated to his fellow-students. Yet this preoccupation with spiritual issues did not prevent him from maintaining an ideal of intellectual sincerity. When a so-called 'liberal theologian' was appointed to Montauban by the State, the students at this 'orthodox' institution made an unfriendly manifestation at his first lecture. Wilfred Monod was not able to be present; but when he heard of the occurrence he sent a visiting-card to the professor with his excuses, thus indicating his sympathy with him. But the professor who had been baited by his hearers had told people in the town about the affair; and a newspaper published the story with observations not very complimentary on the intolerance of future pastors. The students were indignant, and went to complain to the person concerned. When they were told of the step Monod had taken, which recognized the unseemliness of the method they had used, the discussion became acrimonious; and all the students who taught in the Sunday-schools in the parish of a certain unorthodox pastor sent in their resignations. All except

one; for on this occasion Monod went to the church and took the Bible lesson as usual. He wrote afterwards: 'I have rarely felt such a sense of moral solitude. It almost gave me a feeling of suffocation. But such experiences have value as exercises. The will is strengthened by a tonic negation. I see now how decisive those years at college were for my career as a whole. They launched me upon public life; they initiated me into the difficult art of sailing against wind and tide in order to carry out a deliberate and far-reaching programme.'

On the 30th September 1891 Wilfred Monod was married to Mlle Dorina Monod, daughter of Pastor William Monod, Chaplain to the Deaconesses. Bride and bridegroom had been associated in Christian work since the days of their youth. Rich with the finest gifts of mind and heart, Mme Monod admirably supported her husband throughout his career. After being ordained on the 20th April 1892, Monod went to his first pastorate at Condé-sur-Noireau in Calvados, a town engaged in the cotton industry. There he became aware of the class-war, the sufferings of households through industrial disputes, and the misery of the slums. At Condé too he had a kind of mystic experience which gave him a new conception of the Gospel. 'On the eighth of July 1893,' he said, 'while I was praying, Christ was revealed to me in the plenitude of his saving Personality. This experience was essentially moral and religious. . . . There was no outward manifestation, no "apparition". But I had an intense impression that the framework of organized religion was too restricted to contain the Hero of the Gospels. The Son of Man belongs to all the domains of praying, and thinking, and acting humanity. He holds the key to all problems; political, social, moral, and philosophical. . . . From my childhood, Christianity had been presented to me as "salvation"; and this was connected with the contemplation of the Cross . . . but I always had an intuition that on Calvary the supreme fact was not the existence of the Cross, but the presence of the Crucified. The Cross was only an object, an unconscious thing; the Crucified was a Person, consecrated, inspired, and loving. . . . The Holy Spirit was leading me beyond Golgotha. . . . If St Paul proclaimed the Crucified it was because he had seen the light of Easter irradiate the gibbet, like those giant reflectors in our cities which make some monument stand out from the surrounding darkness.' It was this vivid sense of a living Christ, divine because perfectly human, which lay at the heart of Wilfred Monod's future ministry.

After nine years at Condé, Monod went to Rouen as assistant to Pastor E. Roberty, the eloquent exponent of liberal orthodoxy and social righteousness. The problems of an industrial civilization were seen on a larger scale in this metropolis of Normandy, and were made more poignant by the contrast between the physical degradation or moral decadence of the poor and the splendour of their environment. Wilfred Monod's sermons at this time (gathered into a volume, *Sur la Terre*), glowed with a flaming passion for social righteousness, which brought into play his gift of poetical description. Like Isaiah he determined to see for himself the conditions of the city's life. Disguised as a workman he visited the taverns, the cabarets, and the common lodging-houses, varying this with an official call on the Prefect on New Year's Day, and presenting prizes to school-boys and girls on the platform of the Lycée. He entered into contact with people outside the Churches with the

object of removing misunderstandings between the modern world and Christianity, taking part in debates with *libres-penseurs* and socialists. Some of his lectures on these subjects were included in a volume, *Aux Croyants et aux Athées*, which ran into four editions and aroused a good deal of discussion. He took a leading part in the movement for reuniting the various sections of the Reformed Church; and it was partly to facilitate his labours for this cause that he was appointed Pastor of the Oratoire of the Louvre in Paris in 1907.

This famous church in the Rue de Rivoli, in which Queen Anne of Austria had knelt near to the young Louis the Fourteenth, Cardinals Richelieu, Bérulle, Henriette (the widow of the English King Charles the First), and Mme de Sévigné, and from whose pulpit Bourdaloue and Massillon had preached, was given to the Protestants by Napoleon as compensation for their churches destroyed after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The busts of the new pastor's grandfather, Jean Monod, and his great-uncle Adolphe Monod, adorned the vestry of the Presbyterial Council. His father had just ended his ministry in the parish, and in the great hall there had been held in 1848 the Synod in which his paternal grandfather had broken with the Protestantism of the Concordat to found the *Union des Églises Libres*. In the sanctuary he himself had received the nuptial benediction and pastoral consecration. Wilfred Monod's connexion with the Oratoire continued until the end of his life, first as Pastor, and later as Pastor Emeritus. During those years the Oratoire became a centre of liberal evangelism and its services attracted visitors from all parts of the world. Monod's residence in Paris enabled him to carry out some of his ideas as to the training of the ministry, for he was appointed Professor of Pastoral Theology in the Protestant Faculty of Theology in 1909.

Afterwards came the War of 1914-18, with its dislocation of Church and college activities. The Oratoire itself was at one time in danger, for it was in the area in which the shells of 'Big Bertha' fell. The War brought some alteration in his views. Before 1914 he had inclined to the pacifist position; but the German invasion of Belgium and her military barbarities made him believe that they must 'break the Prussian sabre in order to save the international ideal'. On the political side he envisaged the settlement of disputes by arbitration, and on the religious side a reunion of the churches.

It was Monod's belief in the Church's power to serve the cause of peace which led him to take an active part in the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. He was for a long time President of the French committee of the Alliance. He also became closely identified with the Ecumenical Movement; and at the Universal Conference for Practical Christianity held at Stockholm in 1925 he drafted the Message of the Congress to the Churches. When preparations were being made for the Lausanne Conference of 1927 he opposed the first plan of restricting its membership to Churches professing the Trinitarian formula, his own Church not being Trinitarian in the Athanasian sense. The Anglican Archbishop of Dublin interested himself in the matter; and in the end it was decided that 'the Conference should be open to every Church which, having examined the doctrinal basis of the Conference, decided that it could conscientiously participate in it'. At the opening of the Conference Monod preached a noble sermon in the Cathedral at Lausanne. The repercussions of the movement in France

ultimately produced the Union of the two Reformed Churches together with the Methodist and the Free Churches in 1937. During those years Wilfred Monod was probably the best-known ecumenical representative of the French Reformed Churches. He published several books which had a wide circulation, and was an honoured guest in several countries. He was given the degree of Doctor of Divinity, *causa honoris*, by the University of Edinburgh, and during a visit to England in 1927 he preached in Canterbury Cathedral.

Yet those same years were clouded by disappointment. His hopes of promoting world peace by means of the Churches were threatened by racial bitterness. This became especially evident in 1934, when representatives from the Hitler-controlled German Church came to the Council and defended the theory of 'Aryanism'. This, and the outburst of anti-semitism in Germany, showed the infiltration of a pagan racialism incompatible with the religion in which there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian nor Scythian. So when representatives of the German State Church again attended the Council in 1936, Monod refused to take part in the discussions. Serious differences also manifested themselves in the Ecumenical Movement. The representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church absented themselves from several discussions at the Lausanne Conference, and the Church of Rome would not participate in it. Moreover, there was in his own Church a 'change of climate'. The growth of Neo-Calvinism associated with the teachings of Auguste Lecerf, undermined Monod's influence at the Faculty of Theology. His hero-worship of Christ as revealed in the Gospels came to be regarded as a rather weak and ineffective message in face of the dark facts of sin. And his preoccupation with authorship and his many ecclesiastical activities may have prevented that intimate personal contact with his students which would have kept him in touch with their ideals and aspirations. These difficulties came to a head in 1937, and resulted in his resignation of his chair at the Faculty of Theology. In addition to his other chagrins his *Problème du Bien*, a monumental work which cost him immense labour, did not make the impression he had hoped for. He tells of the silence with which it was received. 'Its 3,000 pages sank into oblivion like a heavy sphinx engulfed in the desert sand.' These events and his reflections on them are recorded with frankness, but with an entire absence of bitterness, in *Après la Journée*.

But his disillusionments only threw him back on the Eternal, 'the holy Sion where all is stable and unailing'. His gifts as a preacher were never more manifest than in his later years. His sermons at the Oratoire in 1937-8, contained in the volume, *Voir Jésus*, are probably his best. Much of his time and thought during those years was given to the direction of the Community of the *Veilleurs* founded by him in 1923, a kind of Protestant Third Order inspired by that of St Francis of Assisi. They initiated a liturgical movement in the French Reformed Church, which has made considerable progress. Wilfred Monod had grateful recollections of the kindness of the members of the churches to which he had ministered. He said, '*Ils avaient fleuri le presbytère*'; and a little book, *Souvenez-Vous de Vos Conducteurs*, published by members of the Oratoire in 1948, revealed their affection for the one who had 'pictured Christ and revealed God before their eyes'. The Second World War must have been a heavy blow to him; but his last published sermon on 'The Smile' (Job 20²⁴),

preached at the Oratoire in 1941 in the midst of the German occupation, is full of charity and touched with playful humour. He was active till the last. Even after he had lost the power of remembering what had been told him, he was revising previous work or projecting new, until the pen dropped from his hand. He died in May 1943.

Wilfred Monod's reputation as a writer is likely to endure. He had a natural fluency and ease, and with this an instinct for the right word. His gift of imagery is comparable to that of Victor Hugo. Happy comparisons, allusions, and metaphors, pregnant with meaning, well up spontaneously, and charm the reader by their beauty. He was a poet rather than a philosopher; but the poets often see farther than the philosophers; and this visionary, with his unconventional approach to religion and his transparent sincerity, is theologically stimulating. But it is as a spiritual director that Wilfred Monod excels. He was a saint; and he has the gift of inspiring in others the desire for holiness. It is fortunate that his volume of meditations, *Silence et Prière*, has been translated into English, and it is to be hoped that some of his sermons will soon be translated; for his understanding of human needs, his confidence in the goodness of God, and his glowing devotion to Jesus Christ, give his devotional writings a place beside those of Lacordaire.

HENRY HOGARTH

A SELECTION FROM THE WORKS OF PASTOR WILFRED MONOD
(Published by Fischbacher, Paris, unless otherwise stated)

Sermons: *Sur la Terre. Voir Jésus.*

Meditations: *Silence et Prière* (translated into English by Gladys A. Slade).
Published by H. R. Allenson (1934).

On various subjects: *Vers Dieu* (translated into English under the title of *The Road to God*, by Mrs. R. C. Gillie). Published by A. & C. Black (1928).

La Nuée des Témoins (2 vols.).

Vade-Mecum Pastoral.

Du Protestantisme. Published by Felix Alcan, Paris.

THE SOUL'S AWAKENING

A Study of Youth

ADOLESCENCE—or youth, to translate the term—covers three main periods: 11-13, 13-17, 17-21. The physical change and characteristics of adolescence must be our starting-point for any sound estimate of the emotional and mental development of youth. The fact of puberty is the pivotal factor in the life of the adolescent. The ripening of the body to its social functions is the beginning of the awakening of the whole being to its total environment.

The Soul's Awakening is a phrase comprehensive enough to cover the whole of our study. There is a noticeable order in that awakening:

1. *The Awakening of the Soul to Itself.*
2. *The Awakening of the Soul to the World, and*
3. *The Awakening of the Soul to Others.*
4. *The Awakening of the Soul to God.*

That should be the full process. Its effects, of course, depend upon the adequacy of the awakening in each case and the character or reactions of the objects to which the soul awakens. For example, the dominant idea of God in the conventional thought of the time must vitally affect the last and greatest awakening of the series. We will look at that again later.

I. ITSELF

The very first effect of the physical changes of adolescence is a heightened self-consciousness. The well-known physical gawkiness of the big-hand and leggy stage is enough of itself to produce this effect. The real boy or girl begins to emerge. Up till now the life of the organism has been largely imitation and obedience—it has been a creature under authority sedulously copying the behaviour of its elders. Hence factors of heredity and originality have had but little chance. It is in adolescence that these factors find a chance to escape. This is why all the passion of adolescence is for freedom. This, too, is why the first principle of education for the adolescent must be freedom. Here is the first great moral and spiritual ideal. The organism is deeply concerned to be itself. Something within is trying to get out—in all senses and in all phases. The stress and strain of this means an intense demand for self-knowledge, an impatience of misunderstanding on the part of others, an acute nervousness coupled with a new egoism, a life full of bold dashes and shy retreats. There is instability of character and inconstancy of purpose and inconsistency of thought and action—everything is mercurial and unstable, yet pulsating with fierce secret desire and wistful aspiring.

It is a condition calling for the utmost consideration from one's elders, for a great patience, and considering the environment of the great majority of adolescents in the modern world, a *vast pity*.

If ever there was a clear case for the special education of people for parenthood it is to be found in the clumsy and cruel handling of adolescents. As a

snap-shot instance, take the fact that before the recent war many thousands of boys and girls were turned out from the shelter and authority of our schools full of an intense wistfulness toward life—keen and eager to prove themselves in the great arena and win the spurs of knightly usefulness—only to find their generous ardour crushed, their newly acquired knowledge swiftly rusted and pulled down by the horrible experience of unemployment. Here is a sin against God's 'little ones' which, if ever repeated, may yet hang a mill-stone about the neck of Society and drown it in a sea of retribution.

The rising tide of life in the adolescent quickens every power and makes it clamant. The long reign of feeling is challenged, as the flood of emotion becomes fuller and more turbulent, by a new curiosity. An awakened reason gropes for right understanding and is overwhelmed by the richness of the objective world. In view of such a congested condition of the soul, our schools should honour to the full the adolescent's instinctive passion for freedom. The shackles must be off—this creature is looking for itself and can only find itself if it be untrammelled. No true self-knowledge is possible without freedom (while you are three parts somebody else how can you know what you are really like?)—no true self-reverence is possible till you know what you have to control.

*Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power,*

said Tennyson, and these are the first three spiritual and moral ideals of adolescence.

II. THE WORLD AND OTHERS

But with the awakening to a bigger self-hood comes a new sense of that World which lies over against one's own being and with which one has to cope. The richer physical life of adolescence floods the senses with keener perceptiveness—colours become more colourful, form is more pronounced, the world leaps into vividness of life and beauty, things and gadgets of all kinds achieve a new importance. A heightened sense of relatedness and responsibility arises, which is at once fascinating and disturbing.

Perhaps never before in the history of the race was adolescence in such danger of what we may call comprehensively, 'Worldliness', as in this modern world so full of fascinating contrivances. It is this increased sensationalism of life that explains the blasé condition of many of our intermediate scholars. Fed on violence and sex-lure (cinema films and cheap story- and picture-papers), surrounded by engines that throb and music that grips, their inner selves are constantly denied and starved, and religious teaching can all too easily seem too abstract and dull for them. The mastery of things becomes therefore a very real problem to the adolescent. Added to things, however, are persons, often much less amenable to his or her control. These others can be divided into three main types: the Elder—his enemy; the Opposite—his problem; the Equal—his ally.

It is the pressure of this total problem of the World and Others which arouses the latent herd-instinct and leads to the gang tendency for sheer

self-protection and self-reinforcement. The organism experiments in its search first with those with whom contact is easier—he moves out from his junior egoism through a screen of his fellows toward the opposite sex and in escape from his elders. There are some pertinent remarks to be made therefore about these three types of 'others' to whose presence the adolescent becomes newly sensitive.

(i) *The Elder* is the enemy because he represents bondage—he is the jailer. This is why a policy of freedom is so vital if parent or teacher is to transform himself into friend and become adopted as such. In proportion as this growing human organism senses in you an ally in its escape to true self-hood will you come into a position of guidance and real influence. Only deeds breathing a most comradely spirit can breed such confidence.

(ii) *The Equal*—the fellow-boy or fellow-girl (in numbers for preference, at first) is a great factor in the adolescent's true awakening. Here he is trying himself out in the tricky problem of human relationship. Is he leader of the gang—is she the pivot of the group? Such leaders and pivot personalities should be watched and marked—they are the potential strong ones of the future. The formation of gangs and groups should be encouraged, but with a loyalty focused in a common ideal. The 'patrol' system of the Scouts and the 'companies' of kindred organizations is the right kind of thing. A considerable problem here is how to secure *free* grouping.

(iii) *The Opposite*—the boy and the girl. We must be quite frank as to the great need for sex-guidance for adolescents. Remember that if the Church or school is silent on this matter the child is left to the mercy of many other voices: bad housing-conditions will mis-educate them in sex; precocious love-making (and worse) in cinema films will distort their minds and arouse their passions; bad habits slipped into from curiosity or by accident will pervert their tendencies. Can the one force that stands for cleanness and wholesomeness and for a holy purity afford to be silent or ineffective? Will not modern youth, set amidst the mammonized-exploited sex-lure of modern amusement, have a right to charge the Churches with a gross betrayal and a serious dereliction of duty if it can say, 'the Church never warned me, and my school of God never taught me'? The unnatural silence of parents and teachers on the sex-question is one of the root causes of youth's loss of confidence in its elders on other matters. It is still the most common cause of the cloud of general misunderstanding between children and parents.

Is co-education a good or bad thing? Dr Slaughter in his valuable little book on *The Adolescent* points out that since adolescence begins a year or two earlier with girls than with boys, co-education in the earlier period pulls the boys backward. In mid-adolescence, however, they are more nearly equal and co-education has a better chance of success. In later adolescence there is a recoil from each other which leads on to the period of calf-love. This latter tendency need not be feared; it is usually quite idealistic and pure, and represents very necessary first experiments in mate-finding.

In late adolescence, as the twenties dawn, in all our Churches, in separated sex-groups, the question of preparation for marriage and parenthood and the formation of sound and sensible principles on married probity should become a subject of serious study and skilled instruction.

III. GOD

Now in this further awakening to the World and Others we may define the moral and spiritual ideals of the adolescent very simply, as the attainment first of spirituality, namely the dominance of personality over things—and secondly, of morality, a relationship of progressive harmony with others. But working in the background of these aspirations and endeavours there is always a dim perception of, and often a secretly desperate appeal to, *The Other*—that Ultimate Power—that Highest Being—whom we call God. *I do not believe this perception of God to be ever absent from any adolescent.* It may be deplorably vague and fitful and marred by conventional errors of belief; but we can see how the awakening reason would logically find it practically impossible to become newly alive to the World and to Others without feeling the inevitable shadow of the Ultimate Being. This new interest in God is bound to be quickened by the fears and qualms engendered by the new physical emotional and mental stresses and strains—the sense of new demands made upon inadequate resources—a Supreme Ally is instinctively sought.

Here is the great opportunity of the Christian teacher; but great care needs to be exercised lest the conversion experiences normal to the adolescent should be inadequate and miss the true poles of Christian change. Let us, therefore, put together certain well-established facts.

(a) *There is an absolute need of the comfort and resource of the sense of God on the part of the organism in adolescence.* I ask your pity for the boys and girls who miss it. I ask your belief that if God, in some real way, be offered to boys and girls at this age, they can no more refuse Him than a man perishing of thirst can refuse water. Nevertheless, they may prefer to imbibe secretly rather than openly, they are shy of their newest, deepest feelings—so that the best results are not achieved by blatant methods.

(b) *In the past the most common age for conversion has been the adolescent period. This is a notorious fact.* The famous findings of Dr Starbuck and Dr Coe are generally known. Seventy-five per cent of the conversions investigated occurred between the ages of 12 and 20, with strong groupings around the years 12 and 13, 16 and 17, and 19 and 20.

(c) *In spite of these facts and this great opportunity, there is still in many schools a great leakage of scholars between the intermediate and senior departments.* This occurs even through the years ensuing into the twenties. The reasons for this are in the main two: (1) the opportunity is not seized at all; (2) it is handled inadequately and bad reactions are set up.

Obviously, the most painstaking genius the Church possesses should be concentrated on this problem, especially when we think of the vast numbers of adolescent children outside our schools and churches who might be won back through their urgent moral need at this age.

(d) *There is a natural tendency of the child at this age to conversion.* The sex impulse is an impulse to otherness. What is the true goal of this change? Not merely marriage—not merely a home of one's own. These are but the focus and the training-ground of a wider, fuller, more satisfying relationship—the full dedication of the individual to the full development of his or her powers in the service of an ideal commonwealth. The natural goal is a Kingdom of God.

But so much conversion in the past has been given a purely personal Christ (detached from His social goal) as the terminus of the experience. A purely sentimental relationship with an Unseen Friend—that is the usual prospect of Christian change held out to these youngsters.

I must be careful here not to be misunderstood. No one believes more firmly than I, or rejoices more whole-heartedly, in a Personal Saviour—the supreme necessity of all souls. But we must never forget that Jesus has His own goal and that He seeks to save men for that goal, and we cannot take Him without that goal—that supreme passion of His—an ideal social order for which alone conversion is necessary.

Let me remind you that Jesus allied that goal of the Kingdom to anything He said about conversion. 'Except a man be born again, *he shall not see the Kingdom of God.*' 'Except ye become as little children *ye shall not enter the kingdom of Heaven.*'

Remember, too, how Jesus feared the purely sentimental attachment to Himself. How sternly He always brought it to the test of fulfilment of social relationship. 'Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these ye did it not to Me.' Nor do I forget that often the sentimental relation by its growing understanding of Christ leads on to this social goal.

But the point is that the adolescent's greatest need is *to see as clearly as possible the full rich glory of the social goal* to which his impulse is moving him, so that he may drink deep of what Benjamin Kidd calls 'the emotion of the ideal' and so be provided as early as possible with a programme of social interest and of intensely practical endeavour which can command the full energies of his mind and body.

It is just here, I think, that conventional Christianity has failed the awakening soul. It has checked this budding otherness by throwing the soul into a fever for its own salvation, thus stultifying its progress at the egoistic stage. It has failed to disclose adequately because often it has not itself realized the truth—that the true salvation of the soul is in its movement *away from self to the service of the Society of Souls in the Spirit of God.* The result has so often been that the Christian change has been arrested at a subtle religious egoism and the fine spirited ardour of youth has flowed out into the barren sands of merely sentimental religion.

The social problem in its rich complexity and the social gospel in its noble content mark the highway of truer, sounder, more satisfying conversion and deeper spiritual experience for the youth of our modern world. God is not to be found satisfyingly apart from His Kingdom. That Kingdom is the crowning moral and spiritual ideal not only for adolescents, but for all humankind.

ALBERT D. BELDEN

THE COMING GREAT CHURCH⁷

(Continued from page 16, January 1951)

VI

WHEN WE turn to the prospects for continuing progress in Christian Unity, we may gladly recognize at once that the tidal currents which moved centrifugally for eighteen centuries and then turned so mysteriously and marvellously toward the beginning of the nineteenth century are today continuing to flow centripetally with steadily increasing power and effect. The outlook for progressive fulfilment of Christ's prayer that His followers should all be one is more promising than it has ever been before.

But here, likewise, there are qualifying factors of which full account must be taken. For one thing, a world rifted by division and conflict is an unpropitious setting for any effort toward unification on a global scale. Contemporary political tensions have not only spurred Christians to present a more united witness. They have also lifted a well-nigh impregnable barrier between Christians of the largest and most influential Orthodox Communion, that of Russia, and the rest of Christendom. Thus far, heroic determination to preserve ecumenical fellowship has prevented the rising of similar barriers between other Christians on opposite sides of the several 'curtains' in Central Europe and in Asia. But long continuance of the conflict of 'East' and 'West', and its steady exacerbation, would certainly render that fellowship increasingly difficult.

Again, it is well to recall that trends of thought, within the Churches hardly less than outside them, tend to move by a logic of oscillation from one direction to another, often from one extreme to its opposite. One generation or epoch discerns the oneness of its predecessor, 'discovers' essential truth overlooked by those who have gone before, magnifies the neglected truth as though it were Truth itself, and thus gives its whole allegiance to a fragment of genuine truth with an exaggeration as one-sided as that from which it is in reaction. The succeeding generation or epoch is likely to repeat the process in the reverse direction.

The bearing of this inherent dialectic upon our concern is obvious. We stand near the end, or perchance just pass the end, of an era whose underlying tendencies were centripetal, when the ends of the earth were becoming conscious of one another and when that consciousness was parenting all manner of world associations, scientific, cultural, educational, political, economic, religious. The attempt, twice repeated in thirty years, to achieve effective world political organization, through the League of Nations and then the United Nations, is at once the most ambitious and the most significant illustration. The centripetal currents in the life of the Churches, at their inception, flowed parallel to, even if they were not wholly the spiritual expression of, wider centripetal tides in modern culture. It is a principal glory of the ecumenical movement that, while it thus began when trends in general culture were almost uniformly centripetal, it has continued with accelerated strength after

⁷ This article is from *The Coming-of-Age of Christianity*, edited by Sir James Marchant (Latimer House, 12s. 6d.).

the general cultural drift had suffered radical reversal under the pressures of mighty centrifugal forces which today appear to dominate the world of nations. But Christians and their Churches are all too susceptible to the same logic of oscillation. We may anticipate that ecumenical developments will be subject to challenge from powerful counter tendencies. Question will be pressed whether this movement of Christian Unity, this ecumenical Christianity, is not sweeping too rapidly and perhaps has already gone too far. It will be suggested that unity is purchased at the sacrifice of essential principles, that it can be grounded only on the insecure foundation of the least common denominator. Some such charge is already being whispered where it is not openly declared.

Now, it should be admitted that there is always some truth in such reaction. As suggested above, powerful trends always neglect aspects of familiar and established truth in their enthusiasm for other and previously denied aspects of truth newly discovered. When such an inevitable dialectical swing is supported by dominant currents in the life and thought of the times, it may portend more serious opposition to the movement for Christian Unity than it has had to face in the days of its recent great advance. This suggests the importance of understanding the obstacles to Christian unity which do *not* arise from the special circumstances of the times but are inherent in the problem itself. I shall speak of three.

VII

1. In the first place, while the ideal of the unity of the Church is espoused by all churchmen, there is as yet no clear consensus as to the *character* of the desired unity, how it is to be defined and how it would be recognized. As one of the preparatory papers for the Edinburgh Conference of 1937 put it:

All Christians agree that 'God wills Unity'—in some sense of the word. Every society laying claim to the name 'Church' holds that the Church is by nature a unity—in some sense of the word. But disunity reveals itself when each seeks to unfold the sense of the word.*

To be sure, for great numbers of Christian leaders, the nature of the unity of the Church in its ideal realization is not a live question. Christian Unity means membership within one single Church of Christ. It may be said that this is the unchallenged, and sometimes unchallengeable, view within the Roman Communion and High Anglicanism, and it is widely held elsewhere. Indeed, a major difficulty in achieving a true ecumenical consensus in the matter is precisely the extent to which those who hold this conception tend to regard it as axiomatic, underestimating when they do not disregard the numbers and strength of conviction of fellow Christians who flatly reject what seems to them beyond question. They assume that, in due time, all Christians will 'return' to the only valid conception of the unity of the Church, i.e. their conception.

This is not the view only of those who come from one or another of the 'catholic' branches of the Church. One of the most brilliant younger theologians, a Presbyterian missionary recently consecrated as one of the new

* *The Meaning of Unity* (Report No. 1 of Commission IV), p. vii.

Bishops of the Church of South India, espouses the same certitude with spirited insistence:

The unity of the Church is of its essence. That unity is a spiritual unity. It is also a corporeal unity. . . . The common use of the phrase 'spiritual unity' to refer to something which is understood to be preferable to corporeal unity, something indeed which makes corporeal unity unnecessary, is totally irreconcilable with the teaching of the New Testament. . . . Nothing could more completely reverse the meaning of the New Testament insistence on the spiritual nature of the Church's unity than to say that it meant that visible, corporeal unity was of secondary importance. . . . There is one Spirit, and it follows that there is one Body.⁹

As Bishop Newbigin argues, this conception of the nature of Christian Unity grounds itself upon what it believes to be unequivocal New Testament teaching, especially that of St Paul in his exhortations in 1 Corinthians and Ephesians. This is not the place to examine the validity of this interpretation. It is sufficient to query whether St Paul ever envisioned a 'visible, corporeal unity' of the kind which is in the minds of those who look toward a single Church of Christ as the ideal for the corporate life of His followers on earth. The main point is: this conception and the biblical interpretation upon which it is based are unequivocally rejected by a large, and steadily increasing, proportion of the most ardent devotees of Christian Unity.

Indeed, there are four principal alternative views of the ideal unity of the Church:

(a) The unity of *fellowship*. 'The unity of the Church is a spiritual unity; outward unity of organization is not of the essence of the Church; true Christians are in fact united already.'¹⁰

(b) The unity of *mutual recognition*, involving a free interchange of memberships and ministries and full intercommunion between the several Christian Churches, however numerous and varied they may be. According to this view, the ideal will have been achieved when Christians, whether lay or clerical, while holding membership in some particular branch of the Church, will be universally recognized by all Christians of whatever branch of the Church on a basis of full equality.

(c) The unity of association in fellowship and co-operative action through *federation*, involving full mutual recognition. The numerous existing Councils of Churches culminating in the World Council are imperfect anticipations of the ultimate unity of the Church, imperfect mainly in that full mutual recognition of the member Churches by one another has not yet been achieved.

(d) The unity of complete *corporate or organic union*. This is the 'catholic' view already outlined.

Those who find their ideal of Christian Unity fulfilled in fellowship or in mutual recognition or in federation over against 'visible corporeal unity' argue mainly along these lines:

(a) Theirs, they contend, is the New Testament conception of the Body of Christ—'unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace'.

⁹ Leslie Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church*, pp. 50-4.

¹⁰ Newbigin, *op. cit.*, p. 24. Bishop Newbigin himself rejects this view.

(b) This was, in fact, the nature of the Church's unity throughout the early centuries, a unity of mutual recognition which found an agency for common voice and corporate action through periodic Church Councils. The alteration of this primitive and early conception of the Church's unity in favour of the conception of a single ecclesiastical organization should be recognized as a perversion wrought mainly by the Church of Rome and influenced in no small measure by the parallel development of the political ideal of one Holy Roman Empire.

(c) This pattern of Christian Unity alone can adequately provide for the rich varieties in Christian experience, worship, and organization which God, in His manifold munificence, has in fact brought to birth in the history of the Church and which He intends should continue to enrich the Universal Church.

(d) This pattern of Christian Unity alone can safeguard Christians and their Churches against the ever-present menace of over-large, too powerful ecclesiastical organization with its unfailing corollary of overbearing clerical hierarchy.

Again, it is not our purpose to adjudicate between these alternative views. It is important to recognize that here is an unsettled issue of quite basic moment. And, as will be suggested below, it is a point of division among Christians which grows more rather than less acute as the proportion of Christians who hold firmly to one or another of the 'non-catholic' positions becomes steadily larger.

VIII

2. When we turn to more specific and detailed questions on which Christians presently find themselves divided, the conferences and consultations of the past thirty years have achieved noteworthy progress in identifying and defining these issues.

Contrary to the impression widespread among both laity and clergy, the questions on which there is dissension among the Churches and which hold them apart are not in the great fundamentals of the faith, what Christians affirm concerning God, the world, man, Christ, salvation, immortality. To be sure, there are many differences of conviction on these subjects, and they are often deep and sharply contended. But they are found *within* Communions rather than between them. They are not the causes of continuing Church divisions. At the Edinburgh Conference of 1937 all these matters of basic theological belief were brought together under a single heading and the Conference prefaced its declaration on them with this unanimous affirmation:

We agree on the following statement and recognize that there is in connexion with this subject no ground for maintaining division between Churches.¹¹

Subsequent discussions have confirmed this remarkable affirmation.

What, then, are the sources of divisions? They are discovered to lie wholly within the Doctrine of the Church, more specifically questions of the Sacraments and the Ministry. One has to do with the number of the sacraments, whether seven or two or none. This is a special concern of the Orthodox Communions. But Edinburgh again declared:

¹¹ *Faith and Order*, Edinburgh, 1937, p. 224.

Most of us agree that the question of the number of the sacraments should not be regarded as an insurmountable dividing line when we strive to attain a united Church.¹²

For Christians of Baptist affiliation, the retention of adult or 'believer's' baptism and its restriction to 'those who have made an open profession of faith in Christ and in whose lives some measure of the spirit of Christ may be discerned' is a matter of prime importance. But it must be noted that Baptist churches have entered into organic union with Churches not holding to 'believer's baptism' in China, Siam, and India; and it is not widely held that this issue presents insuperable obstacles to Christian Unity.

Thus attention is brought sharply to focus upon the doctrine of the Christian Ministry, its nature and its authority. Here, by general acknowledgement, is the one presently insurmountable barrier to the realization of whatever form of Church Unity may be agreed upon as the ideal. All Churches profess and treasure 'Apostolic Succession' as they understand it, but they differ as to whether Apostolic Succession and the ministerial authority which it conveys resides in 'the succession of bishops in the principal sees of Christendom', or in 'a succession of ordination by presbyteries', or in 'the maintenance of the Apostles' witness through . . . the perpetuation of the Christian life in the Christian community'. More simply, they hold to an episcopal or presbyterian or congregational principle of Church order. But even on this crucial issue, the Churches within the Ecumenical Movement appear to have been moving toward an important consensus, through the recognition that all three alternative types of Church order were found in the early Church, that all three have obtained for centuries in major Christian Communions and are held by them to be 'essential to the good order of the Church', and therefore that *all three* should find appropriate places in the order of the ideal Church, each bringing 'as to the common life of the united Church its own spiritual treasures'.¹³ This proposed solution of the most intractable obstacle to the unity of Christ's Church—the nature and authority of the Ministry—is often spoken of as 'the principle of comprehension'. It is precisely this principle which is the foundation stone of the scheme of union in South India and has made possible the coming together of Communions representing each of the three major variant traditions into a single fully united Church. In that fact lies the great significance of the achievement of Church union in South India.

It must be added, however, that the South India solution of the problem of orders, based upon the principle of comprehension, has not won the approval of some 'catholic' Church leaders. At Amsterdam, in 1948, they insisted that there are not three but only two main alternative views of the true order of the Church, and that these are still irreconcilable:

In each case we confront a whole corporate tradition of the understanding of Christian faith and life. . . . Each of these views sees every part of the Church's life in the setting of the whole, so that even where parts seem to be similar they are set in a context which, as yet, we find irreconcilable with the whole context of the other.

Mr Oliver Tomkins has stated the issue with admirable clarity and succinctness:

¹² *Faith and Order*, p. 241.

¹³ *ibid.*, p. 257; cf. also, *Faith and Order*, Lausanne, 1927, p. 469.

This division resolves itself broadly into those who hold that the Catholic order of the threefold ministry is of the faith of the Church and those who hold it to be either of convenient administration or a corruption of New Testament order.

IX

3. A final source of difficulty merits the special attention of European Christians and those whose understanding of the Church derives from one of the major European Communions.

In Europe, it is widely assumed that there are only four main types of Church tradition—Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, and Reformation (whether Lutheran or Calvinistic). Since the first three all hold to the general 'catholic' insistence upon 'the visible continuity of the Church in the apostolic succession of the episcopate' while both Lutheran and Calvinistic Protestants deny that Apostolic Succession through the episcopate is of the essence of the Church, Christendom for most Europeans appears to divide into the two parties loosely termed 'catholic' and 'protestant' as the Amsterdam Assembly distinguished them.

It is only natural that Christendom should appear thus in a European perspective. To be sure, adherents of one or another of these four classic traditions are vaguely aware of the existence of other small Christian groups, often regarded as somewhat eccentric and sometimes as esoteric, which sprang from 'radical' or 'sectarian' impulses at and since the Reformation. But little is known of the actual life and faith of these groups, and they are seldom taken seriously. How inevitable that is in Scandinavian lands where Lutherans account for over ninety per cent of all Christians, or in Great Britain where centuries of 'establishment' of Anglicanism in England and Presbyterianism in Scotland have accustomed Britons to think of these as representing the two great alternative types of non-Roman Christianity. 'Sectarian' views of the Church tend to be largely overlooked in discussions of the ideal Unity of the Church.

But in the New Worlds of both North America and the Orient a quite different situation prevails. For example, in the United States twenty-two of the thirty-four Protestant Communions with membership of over 100,000 each, *including the four largest*, belong to the 'free church' tradition. Their combined memberships total almost 30,000,000 in comparison with the slightly more than 10,000,000 Americans of Lutheran, Presbyterian and Reformed, and Anglican affiliation. To state the same fact in different terms, of the eight great denominational families which together account for eighty per cent of American Protestants,¹⁴ five are of 'free church' or 'non-conformist' tradition, and among these are the two largest, the Baptist and the Methodist. Lutherans and Presbyterian-Reformed constitute respectively the third and fourth largest denominational groups while Episcopalians (Anglicans), with less than five per cent, rank sixth.

Among the Younger Churches of Asia, Africa, and Oceania, figures of comparable accuracy are much more difficult to come by. But it appears that well over half of the Christians in 'mission lands' are of 'free church' affiliation.

¹⁴ In the U.S.A., the American branch of the Anglican Communion, the Protestant Episcopal Church, is listed as 'Protestant'.

This is not surprising when it is recalled that only one-eighth of the membership of the Younger Churches has been evangelized by Churches of the European Continent, three-eighths by Christians from the British Commonwealth, and a full half by missionaries from the United States. Moreover, the 'growing edge' of Christian evangelism is in North America and the mission field. There, Churches are advancing most rapidly and vigorously. And there is much evidence that it is the Communion of 'free church' outlook which, on the whole, are increasing their memberships with largest vitality. But it is these Communion which reject most emphatically the 'catholic' doctrine of Church order and authority.

In summary, Christianity as it is found in Europe is in no sense representative of World Christianity. And it becomes less so with each year's advance in growth of the 'free churches'. The bearing of this fact upon discussions of Christian Unity is obvious.

X

We have summarized the accomplishments of Christianity in the period of which we are immediate heirs. We have appraised the promise which those accomplishments open for the Church in the last half of the twentieth century. And we have sought to take the measure of the difficulties which must be met and mastered if that promise is to find fulfilment. If our forecast has seemed unduly apprehensive, it is because the circumstances of the time and the present state of Christendom would make any less sober outlook unrealistic. All that has been said adds up to this conclusion: the possibilities presented to Christians in our day are the most exciting and challenging ever faced by a single generation in the Church's life, but they are shadowed by grave uncertainties. We may well make our own St Paul's summary of his situation: 'A great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries.' It remains to draw from the record of the past certain guiding principles for the days ahead. Let me suggest four:

1. The first is to underscore the overarching lesson from recent history. The phenomenal achievements of the 'Great Century' are the fruitage of not one but two mighty efforts among the Christian Churches, each in fulfilment of an injunction attributed to the Lord of the Church Himself: to make disciples of all nations and to unite those disciples into one living Community. And the two efforts belong together as complementary expressions of a single fidelity. 'The connexion between the movement for Christian reunion and the movement for world evangelization is of the deepest possible character. The two things are the two outward signs of a return to the heart of the Gospel itself.'¹⁵ Ecumenical Christianity, after the figure of the Body, is an organism functioning through two contrasted but inseparably interdependent arms. Neither can be rightly thought of without the other. Neither can function truly and effectively without the other.

2. With respect to both aspects of the ecumenical movement, but especially the effort after Christian Unity, there is no single and simple pathway forward.

¹⁵ Newbigin, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

Advance must be pressed simultaneously along many alternative routes with equal vigour. The question is often put: shall we seek Christian Unity through organic Church union, or through federation, or through co-operation in concrete tasks, or through deepening fellowship? As so often in human thought, a problem presented as a choice of 'either-or' has its solution in the acceptance of 'both-and'. Nothing stands forth from the record more clearly than the fact that the several types of Church collaboration are not mutually exclusive alternatives between which choice must be made but complementary and mutually supporting routes toward a common goal. It is precisely the substantial advance along each of the alternative paths, and many more, which has made possible the epoch-making achievements in Christian Unity in recent decades. There is every reason to expect that the same will hold true for further progress in the coming years.

Similarly with respect to the Christian World Mission, promise for its continuing progress lies not in work in any particular area or of any one type or under any single auspices. The glory of that Mission today is to be discovered in the Christian world movement in its entirety, in its total sweep and reach, made up of thousands of individual centres sponsored by hundreds of agencies in scores of lands on every continent. The largest hope for its future springs from the enlargement and intensification of *all* its multitudinous and multiform enterprises.

3. While the two movements are rightly viewed as correlative and advance in either has, on the whole, served the interests of the other also, the dynamic for both has, in the main, flowed from the effort for world evangelization. As we have said, Christian Missions have parented Christian Unity. In an important sense, therefore, the former is prior and more important for the success of the total undertaking.

There is a corollary of this truth which deserves special attention. One of the most unexpected, and thus far neglected, conclusions from Professor Latourette's monumental surveys of the expansion of Christianity is this. In those periods of retreat which from time to time have overtaken the Church and forced it back, losses have been most acute in those areas where Christian Faith had been rooted longest and with greatest apparent security. Time and again, these ancient centres of Christian strength proved lacking in vitality adequate to withstand the disintegration of the cultures in which they had become enmeshed. As civilization crumbled, the Churches linked to it faltered and often fell. It was the relatively young and seemingly fragile Churches on the frontiers of civilization, not yet domesticated within their enveloping cultures, which proved strong to withstand the cataclysm and endured, shaken but unshattered. By the same token, when retreat has given way to renewed advance and the Christian movement has rallied for new outreach, vitality to requickened the depleted organism has not come from the ancient centres; they have been discovered inadequate to the task. On the contrary, power for fresh advance has come from those areas where the Church had been young when weakness set in, where its very youth made possible vigorous survival under attack, and where its relative disengagement from the dying culture had fostered independence and creative life.

The meaning of this unexpected fact for our day is clear. If it should prove

that the 'Great Century' reached its climax with the advent of the epoch of the 'Great Wars', if we are entering a period to be characterized by disintegration of culture and temporary recession for the Christian cause, we know where we may look for the centres of vitality which may be expected to empower the advance which will surely some day be resumed. We should look to the youngest Christian Churches, but recently born of the modern missionary outreach. In that perspective, the so-called 'Younger Churches' assume an importance all out of relation to their size, maturity, and apparent strength.

4. Finally, Christians may face the uncertainties ahead not only with good hope born of their fundamental faith in the power of God, but also with high confidence justified by what He has graciously accomplished through the weak and sinful organs of Christ's Church in these latter days. For the first time in its history, the Church confronts both the promise and the perils of the future as a world-wide reality, no longer limited to a single continent or area, but firmly planted on every continent and in almost every nation; no longer so tied to a particular culture that it would be imperilled by that culture's eclipse or collapse, but deeply rooted in peoples of every culture, yet emancipated from cultural servitude by their participation in a transcultural community. The World Church enters that future as the bearer of a Gospel whose ability to win the adherence of all men is no longer a hazard of faith but a proven fact established by the convinced allegiance of representative men and women of every class and type and race and culture of mankind. That God will in His own good time translate this anticipation of Christ's Universal Church into the actuality of that Church in its fullness remains a cardinal article of faith. That He may utilize the next five decades to approximate that fulfilment should inspire the efforts of those who are privileged to guide the Church to the eve of its third millennium, and cause them to lift up their eyes with eager expectation.

HENRY PITNEY VAN DUSEN

A FRESH DISCUSSION OF REVELATION

ALL CHRISTIANS are in agreement about the unique position of the Bible. It does not only rise far above all other collections of sacred books: it is to us the organ of the revelation of the one true God. This conviction, however, may be expressed in different terms. 'The Bible is the word of God.' 'The word of God is in the Bible.' 'The Bible is an authoritative record of fact.' 'It is an inspired interpretation of doctrine.' 'It is the charter and constitution', as some would say, 'of the Christian Church.' 'It is the vehicle', others would add, 'through which God speaks to my soul.'

Doctrine: yes—but what doctrine does not need interpretation and exposition and enforcement? Hence, the Bible itself becomes a call, an appeal, to a teaching and authoritative Church; to a community or sect entrusted with some view of the truth which enlightens all the rest; or to the Holy Spirit bearing His witness in the hearts of believers.

Till the past hundred or even fifty years, theology, the study of the Bible, lived for the most part as the queen of the sciences in a palace of her own, while her subjects went about their business in the dusty streets below. But of late the palace has been assailed from all sides. Biblical criticism has examined and cross-questioned the sacred documents, going far to turn the oracles divine into the recollections and aspirations of authors all too human. Psychology has dug beneath the convictions of the prophets, turning their 'Thus saith the Lord' into an 'I would bet my life'. Anthropology has compared the rites and cultus of the Hebrews with the practices of the Greek temple, the Indian village shrine, and the Amazonian jungle—till folk-lore and magic are heard whispering on Mount Moriah.

Further, the old debate between prophet and priest has been renewed. Are we to look for revelation in the prophetic word, or in the cultus of the shrine of which the prophet was not, we are told, a rival, but a supporter? Or, to cast our glances in another direction, since Judaism, like Christianity and Islam, was a 'historical' religion, must we not find revelation in the outstanding events which dominate the whole landscape, the crossing of the Red Sea, the Exile and the Return, the Incarnation and Death and Resurrection of the Son of God, and the rise of the Christian Church? When all this is settled, we may hope at last to be in a position to commend the revelation to the pagan world of today.

With such a course in our minds, we cannot but welcome Dr L. S. Thornton's *Revelation and the Modern World* (Dacre Press, 30s.). Dr Thornton, of the Community of the Resurrection, is already known by his weighty volume, *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*, and his contribution to *The Apostolic Ministry*, edited by the Bishop of Oxford. Those who admire his combination of subtle and meticulous exposition with broad and far-reaching conclusions and deep spiritual feeling, will find it here; but there is little about revelation as we have been thinking of it, and still less about the modern world.

'The revelation of Deity is not shut up in sacred books, but embodied in a holy community which persists through history.' We find it therefore in the Bible, the Christian community, and the work of the theologians. We must

look for it in the history of Israel, the 'facts' of the Gospel records, and the teaching of the Apostles and the fathers. Or we must pass (as he puts it elsewhere) from men (Adam and his sons) to Christ, the 'last Adam', and to Christendom as a whole, and the Church. Beyond, and yet in the midst of this pilgrimage of the intellect, is the great conception of the summing up of all things in Christ, on which our guide, for a quarter of the book, is Irenaeus. (Readers of Marcel's Gifford Lectures will remember his emphasis on 'ingatheredness'.)

The journey is long and not easy. The guide sometimes delays us rather irritatingly; sometimes hurries us past spots we wish to investigate. But, as often happens, we can understand the author the better if we note what he dislikes as well as what he admires. What Dr Thornton dislikes is 'liberalism' or 'humanism'; by which he means the habit of thought that sets man in the place of God and (not always the same thing) sets ethics and conduct in the place of theology and metaphysics. Indeed, he seems to have a strangely low opinion of the value of the moral teaching of the Bible; and the work of prophets and apostles as preachers of righteousness, whether by that term is understood right conduct to our neighbours or right relations with God, is hardly mentioned.

The book really illustrates the strength and weakness of the venerated patristic writers—Irenaeus at their centre. The fathers, it must be admitted, like the Plymouth Brethren of our own day, 'knew their Bibles'. But their knowledge was of detached texts rather than of the books and authors as a whole. In ages when printing was unknown, it was easier to pore over verses here and there than to reach a bird's-eye view of the entire work of a writer. The fathers knew nothing of criticism, in its higher or its lower sense; but they found symbols and metaphors everywhere, and they took with all seriousness the double meaning of words: *cosmos*, for example, which means both order and the disordered world; tradition, which is used for the handing on of received truth or the handing over of Jesus to his enemies; Eve, the mother of all living, and the representative of the 'holy mother', the Church, the bride and the body of her Lord.

Dr Thornton, of course, is well aware of the effects of modern criticism on our knowledge of the Bible; but it is not unjust to call his standpoint pre-critical. It is all to the good to see the whole in the parts, the parts in the whole; but, modern critical writers apart, it is never safe to forget the cautious scholastic 'distinguo'. And when we turn, for example, to the consideration of the cultus of the Old Testament, and find the sacrifices there linked to the fertility cults of Ras Shamra, we cannot but wonder whether we shall be led down the garden path by Sir J. G. Frazer, or whether we are right in forgetting the prophetic denunciations of the disgusting debauchery of the high places and even of the pre-exilic temple.

On the other hand, with the author's enthusiasm for 'wholeness', which would surely win the approval of Hegel and F. H. Bradley, there are certain omissions, or, if the word may be allowed, near omissions, of what would have strengthened his argument, and certainly his fidelity to scripture. All the theological thought that lies behind the Jewish institution of the sin-offering is passed over, and all the stress of the prophets on forgiveness and redemption.

It is strange that Wheeler Robinson, to whom Dr Thornton often refers, has not recalled this to his mind or his pen. When we turn to the Fourth Gospel we find a quite inadequate exposition of the filial relation (which Dr Thornton seems to think of chiefly as that between the rabbi or the *guru* and the pupil, his 'son') and an almost complete silence on the Johannine presentation of love, as between the Father and the Son, and the sons or children. Equally disappointing are the references to sin, the fall, and the whole problem of evil. It was to others as well as Boso that Anselm addressed his stern caution: 'You have not yet taken into account the enormity of sin.' Augustine was more than the supplementer, as he appears in these pages, of Irenaeus. Has revelation nothing to do with God's mercy to a lost and ruined world as seen on the Cross?

To say this, however, is to ask Dr Thornton to give us more out of the treasures of the study which he has made peculiarly his own; to show how the 'two complementary forms of divine activity', creation and revelation, are fulfilled in redemption. Nor perhaps are we asking in vain. This volume is only the first part of Dr Thornton's work: its sub-title is 'the Form of the Servant', which links Isaiah 53 to Philippians 2. The Lord came to make himself 'one with the lowly'. Dr Thornton promises us a second. He has given us, in the two writings mentioned above, the results of much deep meditation on the Suffering Servant. Perhaps his second volume, when it appears, will supply what he forces his readers to feel that they miss in the first. Perhaps, too, we may find there the principle of personal reciprocity in revelation; it is the starting point of an article on Revelation by C. H. Dodd (*Expository Times*, June 1940), in which he anticipates much of the valuable results of this volume, and of what we may hope to receive, worked out with all Dr Thornton's skill, in its successor. Dr Thornton is a loyal supporter of the ecclesiastical school, which, following the Bishop of Oxford, is so occupied with the Pauline metaphors of the Church as the 'body' or 'bride' of Christ, that it forgets, or even repudiates, the 'encounter', as Barth has called it, of the individual with his Saviour. But surely the history of mass entrances into the Church, whether of Frankish barbarians in the ninth century or Indian outcastes in the twentieth, should warn us against a view of revelation which puts the conviction, 'He loved *me* and gave Himself for *me*,' into the background. Still, whether in the background or not, it is there. Dr Thornton is more catholic than he sometimes allows us to suspect; and we cannot but be grateful for the contention, urged as the massive argument draws to its close, that all the various forms of interdependence in the physical world testify to its spiritual character, and, answering as they do to the form of revelation in theology, can claim their share in that great word: 'The hand that made us is divine.'

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

SOCIETY FOR THE REFORMATION OF MANNERS

(With a glance at Rev. Samuel Wesley and the Restoration Drama)

TOWARD the close of the seventeenth century in England there sprang up for the improvement of public behaviour a number of societies of which the best known is the Society for the Reformation of Manners. There is some argument about the exact date when the Society came into being. Tyerman states that 'the Society for the Reformation of Manners was first instituted about the year 1677'¹ but Traill and Mann state that the first use of the title was in 1692.² Probably in the first place these societies were known simply as Societies of Reformation, the phrase 'of Manners' being added later. At the time the word 'manners' carried the connotation of 'morals', as well as the more superficial sense in which it is now used.

Originally the societies were religious groups for mutual edification. In 1699 in Nottingham, Gloucester, and other such places, thirty-nine Religious Societies were meeting for prayer, psalms, Bible-study, and good works. The members were at first drawn mainly from the Church of England. Later, when they developed public activity, and many Dissenters, like Defoe, sought to join, there was some hesitation and suspicion on the part of the Anglican authorities.

After the Protestant Revolution the number of these societies multiplied, and gradually they found themselves drawn to turn attention to various public scandals. Many people thought that a change in public behaviour was seriously needed, but the majority felt that no action could be taken until after the war. 'When things were at this dismal and almost desperate pass, it came into the hearts . . . of five or six private gentlemen of the Church of England to engage in this difficult and hazardous enterprise, who considered that the higher the tide of wickedness was, the more need there was of opposing it. . . .'³ They therefore determined to put the appropriate laws in execution. With the approval of the Queen they banded together and made it their business to inform magistrates about swearers, adulterers, Sabbath-breakers, and the like. Some magistrates encouraged them, but others treated them roughly.⁴ The expenses of prosecution were met by subscriptions from the members, and fines accruing were given to charities.

In 1694 the Society for Reformation published *Proposals for a National Reformation of Manners*, which was printed for John Dunton, publisher, bookseller, and political pamphleteer.⁵ Three documents were printed and bound together in one volume, as follows:

1. (a) Abstract of all the penal laws against vice and profanity. (b) Prudential rules for the legal conviction of offenders.
2. A letter from the Queen, through Tillotson, to the magistrates.
3. The magistrates' consent.

Copies of this publication were sent all over the kingdom and blank warrants deposited in various places in London for the convenience of informers.

¹ *Life and Times of the Rev. Samuel Wesley*, p. 213.

² *Social England*, IV.

³ *An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners*.

⁴ cf. Burnet's *History of our own Times*, 1st ed., II.318.

⁵ cf. Tyerman, *op. cit.*, *The Athenian Oracle*, III.30. Between 1690 and 1696 Dunton issued *The Athenian Gazette*, afterwards known as *The Athenian Mercury*; presumably *The Athenian Oracle* was a related periodical.

The inevitable charge was soon forthcoming that fees were paid to the magistrates, but the author of the article on the subject in *The Athenian Oracle* (Tyerman thinks it was Samuel Wesley) had no difficulty in disposing of the charge stating that 140 warrants had already been issued without one farthing fees having been paid.⁶

In 1698, in *A Poor Man's Plea in relation to all the Proclamations for a Reformation of Manners and Suppressing Immorality*, Defoe analysed the situation as it appeared to the rank and file of decent people. 'Immorality is without doubt the present reigning Distemper of the Nation. And King and Parliament, who are indeed the proper Physicians, seem nobly inclin'd to undertake the cure.'⁷ Reviewing the history of the subject, Defoe claims that the Protestant reformation in religion led to a reformation in manners. Unfortunately the Stuarts, beginning with James the First, aided and abetted by Laud's *Book of Sports*, sowed and cultivated a crop of licentiousness. 'And yet the people felt aversion to the liberty, and some, as if glutted by too much freedom, when the reins of law were taken off, refus'd that Practice they allowed themselves in before.'⁸ Defoe applauds the efforts, proclamations, and laws issued under the influence of William the Third and Mary, 'but we of the Plebeii find ourselves justly aggrieved'⁹ because there is too much discrimination between the poor and the rich. The laws are not often put in operation, and when they are so used, it is against the poor, who, after all, are but imitating the gentry. To punish the poor is like taking away the effect that the cause may cease!

Further objections are then examined. The justices are passive magistrates, helpless till evidence is brought before them, it is alleged. Defoe replies that they could take pains to know the area within their jurisdiction. Again it is said that informing is in bad odour, but Defoe replies that this is not true when the information is aimed at the Dissenters! Thirdly, it is said that vice is part of human nature; but Defoe replies that religion does not accept this defeatist view of human nature, and that much more could be done if the gentry would reform—by far the most efficient proof of the possibilities of overcoming vice inherent in human nature.

Signs of developing organization now appear. The Society became a large body, and two sections were appointed, one to act in London and the other in Westminster. Thousands were punished for drinking and swearing. In 1698 the Rev. Samuel Wesley preached a sermon before one of the Religious Societies, first at St James's Church on 13th February, and afterwards at St Bride's, the dedication being offered to 'The Societies for the Reformation of Manners'.

In 1699 an anonymous work was published (sometimes attributed to Defoe and sometimes to Josiah Woodward), entitled: *An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners in London and Westminster, and other parts of the Kingdom, with a Persuasive to Persons of all Ranks, to be zealous and diligent in promoting the execution of the Laws against Prophaneness and Debauchery, for the effecting a National Reformation*. The organization was now elaborate. A number of societies had been formed each with its special function. One society consisted mainly of tradesmen,

⁶ Tyerman, op. cit., III.30.

⁷ *True Collection of the Writings of the Author of the True-Born Englishman*, 2nd edn (1703), I.284.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 286.

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 287.

fifty in number, whose responsibility was to deal with disorderly houses. In conjunction with the Lord Mayor and the Court of Aldermen this society had effected the suppression of 500 such establishments, and thousands of lewd persons had been punished. Constables were united in a third society, and informers in a fourth. There were eight other 'regulated and mixt' bodies of housekeepers and officers in the several quarters of London, Westminster, and Southwark. In this same year similar societies are recorded in Leicester, Coventry, Shrewsbury, Hull, Tamworth, Newcastle, Liverpool, and Chester. A circular from Archbishop Tennyson encouraged clergy to meet the laity in order to devise further methods of effective prosecution. Arrangements were now made for quarterly lectures on moral subjects, with sermons at St Mary's-le-Bow Church twice a quarter.

The Society achieved greater influence during this year by the accession of 'divers persons of quality', including twenty-nine members of the nobility, seven judges, and six bishops (Trail and Mann). Presumably these are the same Lords Temporal, Spiritual, and Judges, who appended the imposing list of signatories to the commendatory letter appended to *An Account of the Societies*, etc., referred to previously. In this book the King's Proclamation of 24th February 1697 is given in full, Her late Majesty's Gracious Letter (in the absence of the King) on 9th July 1691 to the Justices of the Peace of the County of Middlesex, and the House of Commons Address to the King.

The substance of the book deals mainly with argument for all types of legal action. An abstract of Penal Laws is added at the end, also Blank Warrants against profanity, etc., advertisement of their purpose, and Blank Registers for such warrants. 'The application of the money so used' is 'to the use of the poor.'

This account reveals various types of objection offered to the proposals. Archbishop Sharp was suspicious of any attempt at co-operation between the Anglicans and the Dissenters, and tried to prevent joint action at Nottingham, York, and Carlisle. Some objected that the proposals were impracticable. Some likely supporters consulted worldly wisdom before principle. Vested interests were naturally antagonistic, and furthered their interests by 'clubs and confederacies'. Despite keen scrutiny by the opposition no flaw was found in the armour of the reformers. No illegal methods were used, and no hidden secular interests discovered. It was, of course, ungrateful work, 'since it is the opposing of men in their sinful indulgencies, which are often more desirable to them than their very lives'.¹⁰

One of the leading writers for the Society was Daniel Defoe, although he was suspect among the Anglican authorities as a Dissenter. The purpose of the Society, he claims, is not so much to attack private vice, as to prod into action the authorities in whom are vested the powers to reform manners. In *The Reformation of Manners: A Satyr*, printed in 1702, he divides his remarks into two parts: one aimed against the City authorities and the second against the provincial, rural, and Court authorities. In each case the clergy and magistrates receive severe handling.

When the retort is thrown that the reformers are not themselves faultless, Defoe replies: 'Tis a pretty way for Men to get rid of the Impertinence of

Admonition. If none but faultless Men must reprove others, the Lord ha' Mercy upon all our Magistrates; and all our Clergy are undignified and suspended at a blow.'¹¹

In a further pamphlet the following year, *More Reformation: A Satyr upon Himself*, Defoe returns to the same point.

In 1706 Defoe was delighted with the 'unparalleled rapidity of reform . . . in such a time and in such circumstances'.¹²

The further history of the Society is obscure. At one time mob violence threatened danger to informers, and one member of the Society was murdered. Defoe notes in *The Review*¹³ that Sacheverell preached against informers.

Between 1730 and 1757 the Society gradually faded away. In 1758 W. Welsh, a friend of the Wesleys, revived the organization, and in 1763 John Wesley preached one of the official sermons before the members, from the same text as his Father, sixty-five years previously, although the place was different, being the West Street Chapel, Seven Dials.¹⁴ In 1766, however, the Society was killed by an adverse decision, obtained by perjury, in the Court of King's Bench. Damages to the extent of £300 were awarded against the Society, and from this blow it did not recover.

Naturally the attention of the Society was directed from time to time toward the stage, and there are several references to law-suits initiated by it. The most direct reference to the theatre in their publications is to be found in Samuel Wesley's Sermon, so opportunely delivered at the very moment of the first devastating attack by Jeremy Collier.

The sermon provides an excellent summary of the attitude of the reformers, who felt themselves called to engage in a battle against indecency, although themselves unhappy to be engaged in so defiling an occupation.

The text is taken from Psalm 104, verse 16: 'Who will rise up for me against the evildoers, or who will stand up for me against the workers of iniquity?' The outline of the sermon is as follows:

- (a) It is difficult to persuade men to engage in the cause of God against wicked persons.
- (b) It is 'the indispensable duty of Good Men, with united Councils, and with the utmost Zeal and Prudence, to oppose Vice and Wickedness'.¹⁵
 - i. Good men ought to oppose vice.
 - ii. With United endeavours and 'councils'.
 - iii. With Zeal and Prudence.

Under (i): (A) Men are bound by strong obligations:

- by Baptism to defend the Faith, which needs to attack its attackers;
- by the Servant-relationship, under which Christ bought us.

(B) True interests are guarded.

Civil Happiness.

As part of the community we should desire the good of the whole. 'Now 'tis hard to say whether has done the greater mischief to the Publick, either

Ill Principles, which have taken Men off from their Passionate Regard for

¹¹ Preface.

¹² *The Review*, III.613-14.

¹³ loc. cit.

¹⁴ Tyerman, op. cit., 213; cf. *Wesley's Works*, VI.140.

¹⁵ Sermon preached before the Society for the Reformation of Manners, 13th February 1698. Page 4. The preface to Jeremy Collier's *Short View of the Immorality . . . of the Stage* is dated March 1st 1698.

their Country, which was so remarkable and so glorious among antient Heathens, or else a Bad Life and a Dissolution of Manners.'¹⁶

2. Domestic Happiness.

Discipline renders all relations 'more useful, and comfortable, and happy'.

3. Personal Happiness.

4. Spiritual Happiness.

5. Eternal Happiness.

Under (ii): The Church is a regulated Society of Men firmly united to practise good and defeat evil.

Under (iii): (A) Zeal.

'Zeal in moral affairs seems to have much the same surprising effects which motion has in physical and mechanical; it produces what seemed at first impossible, it gives a new mould and turn to every action; it sets on work all the secret springs and powers of the mind, and makes them act with such a force and vigour as is almost irresistible.'¹⁷

(B) Prudence.

The Devil is on the look-out for lack of charity, for weaknesses in reformers themselves and in their families. Prudence and charity in argument are stressed, and warnings issued against Pharisaical attitudes or forbidding others to cast out the Devils just because they do not walk with the reformer in all things. (This, no doubt, is a sidelong glance at those who would reject the Dissenters.)

From these principles Wesley infers the necessity to reprove those who encourage vice by a 'voluntary intimacy' with vicious men, especially those who 'for some years last past enter'd into a sworn conspiracy against Religion and Virtue. There scarce seems any need to explain myself, that hereby I mean our infamous Theatres, which seem to have done more mischief, than Hobes himself, or our new Atheistical Clubs, to the Faith and Morals of the Nation.'¹⁸

Developing this point he admits that 'Moral Representations are own'd to be in their own Nature, not only Innocent, but even useful as well as pleasant'.¹⁹ Nevertheless, following the Early Fathers of the Church, he ranks plays with idolatry, and complains that they become 'Schools of Vice, and Nurseries of Profaneness and Lewdness'.²⁰ Would any decent person allow his friend or child to go into such a 'Pesthouse . . . infected with any contagious and deadly Disease'?²¹

Wesley attacks the stage on the same grounds as Jeremy Collier, and rebuts the defence of the stage as itself a reforming institution. 'Tis true the State pretends to Reform Manners, but let them tell us how many converts they can name . . .'²²

T. D. MEADLEY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1671-1731 *Historical Account of my own life*, E. CALAMY

1699 *An Account of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners* . . .

1866 *Life and Times of the Rev. Samuel Wesley*, L. TYERMAN

1895 *Social England*, Vol. IV, H. D. TRAILL and J. S. MANN (who refer to Coke, *Detection* iii, p. 66; and Wilson, *Defoe*, I.297).

¹⁶ Sermon preached before the Society for the Reformation of Manners, 13th February, 1698, pp.8-9.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, p. 16.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁹ *ibid.*

²⁰ *ibid.*, p. 21.

²¹ *ibid.*, p. 22.

²² *ibid.*

Ecumenical Survey

COMMUNICATED THROUGH THE REV. PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A.

METHODISM IN LATIN AMERICA¹

METHODISM has been established in eleven Latin American countries, as follows: Argentina in 1836, Bolivia in 1906, Brazil in 1876, Chile in 1877, Costa Rica in 1918, Cuba in 1899, Mexico in 1872-3, Panama in 1905, Peru in 1877-8, Puerto Rico in 1900, and Uruguay in 1839. In the years 1836-7 Methodist work in Argentina was limited to a single English-speaking congregation—the First Methodist Church, now located on one of the leading avenues of the city. Many years ago there was Methodist work in Paraguay, but this field was later left to the care of the Disciples of Christ. In the Dominican Republic, the Methodist churches were incorporated into the Dominican Evangelical Church, which now has more than 20,000 members.

In all this work emphasis has been laid chiefly on evangelism and education, and its extension and influence have been due mainly to this fact. Social work has not been neglected. There has been a liberal spirit with reference to co-operation with other denominations, and in many cases Methodism has been in the vanguard of the ecumenical movement. Methodism has also combatted the errors of the Roman Catholic Church; and it is said that in some places Romanism fears the 'Methodists' more than it fears 'Protestants', as though the former were a group apart from the latter.

Methodism in Latin America is gradually taking on local forms of organization and adapting itself to the Latin American environment, without losing in any sense the common doctrinal basis of all evangelical Churches. Since 1932 the Methodist churches in Mexico and Brazil have been completely autonomous, although they maintain fraternal relations with the mother Churches in the United States, which continue to send them contributions in personnel and financial support for the development of the work. The Methodist churches which still form an integral part of their mother Church have also been given relative freedom of action, and in their local fields are nearly as autonomous as those of Brazil and Mexico. The churches of seven countries form the 'Central Conference of the Methodist Church in Latin America'. This Conference is divided into two areas: the Pacific Area, including Chile, Peru, Panama, and Costa Rica; and the River Plate Area, including Argentina, Bolivia, and Uruguay. This Central Conference has authority to elect its own Bishops and to make such modifications in the *Discipline* as are not contrary to the Constitution and General Rules established by the General Conference. The work is further sub-divided into two Annual Conferences (Chile and the River Plate) and three Provisional Annual Conferences (Bolivia, Peru, and Panama-Costa Rica).

The Methodist Church in Mexico includes two Annual Conferences, and the Methodist Church in Brazil, three. They are governed by General Conferences,

¹ Translated from the Spanish by the Rev. Dr B. F. Stockwell, Buenos Aires.

which meet every four years in Mexico, and every five years in Brazil. Both have power to establish their own *Discipline* and to elect their own Bishops. The Bishops of the Central Conference are elected for a period of four years and may be re-elected.

The Methodist work in Cuba and Puerto Rico depends directly upon the Methodist Church in the United States. Episcopal supervision is provided for Puerto Rico by the Bishop of the Washington Area, and for Cuba by the Florida Area.

All the Annual Conferences are divided into districts. The District Superintendents, outside of Puerto Rico and Cuba, are elected by the Annual Conferences, from among names presented by the presiding Bishop. Outside Brazil these Superintendents may not serve longer than six years and may not be re-elected under less than three years. The Bishop and the District Superintendents are responsible for the appointment of pastors at each session of the Annual Conference.

Methodist work has not grown as rapidly in some countries as in others. It has developed most rapidly in Brazil and Mexico. The following statistics indicate this rapid growth:

<i>Mexico</i>	<i>1938</i>	<i>1949</i>
Local preachers	48	77
Itinerant preachers	59	70
Deaconesses and other workers	15	22
Church buildings	106	143
Other preaching-places	201	315
Members	13,000	28,247
 <i>Brazil</i>	 <i>1930</i>	 <i>1950</i>
Local preachers	71	114
Itinerant preachers	76	113
Organized churches	157	263
Other groups		911
Members	15,560	34,888

The Methodist Church in Mexico is advancing, proportionally, more rapidly than any other in Latin America.

All this Methodist work was established originally by the two larger branches of North American Methodism now included in the Methodist Church of the United States. As yet none of the independent national Methodist churches is able to carry forward its work alone. There are nearly 350 missionaries, men and women, at work in these eleven fields. Fifty of them came to Latin America last year—young college-graduates who have come for a period of three years to help, especially in educational work. In addition to this valuable help in personnel, the North American churches contribute from twenty to eighty per cent of the funds needed for the support of the work in the different countries. All the work is carried on, however, under the authority of the local Annual Conferences; and only in exceptional cases are personal appointments or financial decisions dependent upon the approval of the mother Church.

Someone may ask: 'If the mother Church should cease to send these con-

tributions in men and money, what would happen to Methodist work in Latin America? We do not hesitate to say that the work would go right on. Naturally, the lack of such help would be felt for some time, and it would be necessary to limit the action of the Church in some quarters. National leaders would be left to assume an almost oppressive responsibility, and the advance would be considerably retarded. In no sense however would the work be uprooted, not even where it is only beginning. The Methodist Church is in Latin America to stay. In some countries, outside help will no longer be necessary within a few years. Strong congregations are being formed which feel the responsibility of carrying the whole burden, and this spirit is spreading. In some fields the national churches already carry eighty per cent or more of their support. In one country, Uruguay, the churches maintain all their national workers, although they receive some aid still for building and for evangelistic advance.

The Methodist Church in Latin America, as we said before, is ecumenical in spirit. Although Methodists revere John Wesley as one of the great leaders of the Christian Church, Latin American Methodism has not been sectarian or exclusivistic in spirit. It has always responded with enthusiasm to calls for co-operation, and has oftentimes taken the lead in the ecumenical movement. If the opportunity comes for an organic union of the evangelical Churches, or at least of a number of them, the Methodist Church will be among the first to join in such a union. Its liberal spirit has led some to accuse it of inconsistency and fluctuation; but as a matter of fact this spirit has its origin in the work of Wesley who was more interested in Christian love than in ecclesiastical forms.

The Methodist Churches in Latin America, with the single exception of Brazil, have increasingly co-operated with other Churches in the training of their ministers. Few Churches have a deeper conviction that the evangelical Church of the future depends upon the character of its national ministry. Hence, no effort can be too great in the interest of preparing effective pastors. Upon the quality and fervour of her leadership depend the nature and value of her work. Consequently in ten of the eleven countries in which there is Methodist work, Methodists have co-operated with union seminaries: in Buenos Aires, with the Facultad Evangélica de Teología, which serves students from Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, and Uruguay; in Puerto Rico and Cuba with the union seminaries, which serve students from Costa Rica and Panama, as well as those of their own countries; and with the Evangelical Seminary of Mexico. The Methodist Church of Brazil has its own seminary near the city of San Paulo, with an enrolment of almost fifty. The other ten countries have nearly a hundred students in the union seminaries named above, and another hundred are taking preparatory courses leading to theology, or attending Bible institutes whose requirements are less exacting. There is no doubt that the leading theological institution among evangelicals is the Facultad Evangélica de Teología in Buenos Aires, in which co-operate Disciples of Christ, Waldensians, Presbyterians, and Methodists. In 1950 this Facultad had on its rolls sixty-one students, of whom forty-five were Methodists from five different countries. This is a co-educational institution, and many of the women students become deaconesses or pastors' assistants.

Another great contribution has been in the field of Christian literature, the two principal centres of production being Buenos Aires and the city of

Mexico. Then comes Brazil. The interdenominational committees on Christian Literature in Buenos Aires and Mexico have blazed the trail for other similar organizations in other parts of the world. Not only have they published a great many books of European or North American origin, but also have stimulated national writers to produce more and more. In Buenos Aires, the Aurora publishing house alone, co-operating with the Christian Literature Committee of the Confederation of Protestant Churches, in 1949 published twenty-two books, with a distribution of 67,000 copies. Some works have reached a third or fourth edition. The official translator and editor of that Christian Literature Committee is a Methodist Argentine pastor. The president of the Committee and the manager of the Aurora publishing house are also Methodists. Under the auspices of the same Committee, the Facultad Evangélica de Teología and the Aurora publish a quarterly review for ministers, *El Predicador Evangélico*. Now in its eighth year, it has 1,600 subscribers in almost all the Latin American countries, including Brazil, even though it be a Spanish language publication. Its manager and editor-in-chief are Methodists. In connexion with this review two series of books for pastors are being published: one which is called the *Library of the Evangelical Preacher*, in which has been published the splendid book of Charles Silvester Horne, *The Romance of Preaching*.

It follows that Methodists have taken part in the confederations of evangelical Churches, co-operating in a real brotherly spirit to promote the Christian cause. In this way they have contributed not only to theological education and to literature, but to other projects such as freedom of worship, civil rights, the social regeneration of the masses, and the evangelizing of the indigenous people. In the River Plate region this ecumenical spirit has received more emphasis than possibly elsewhere. The Methodist Church co-operates in the educational work of *Colegio Ward*, with the Disciples of Christ, and in the medical and hospital associations which in Argentina and Uruguay look forward to having their own hospitals. Methodist young people have co-operated with the youth federations, instead of having their own organization, and have contributed to the publication of two valuable papers, *La Idea* in Uruguay and *Cultura* in Argentina. Owing to the fervour of this ecumenical-minded youth, the first Congress of Latin American Evangelical Youth was held in Lima, Peru, in 1941, and the second in Havana, Cuba, in 1946. Thus the Latin American Union of Evangelical Youth took definite shape. The contribution of Methodist young people has been notable, and several of them were sent to Oslo and Amsterdam to represent Latin American Evangelical Youth in international gatherings.

Likewise, Methodist women have co-operated, especially in Argentina and Uruguay, in interdenominational women's organizations. In Argentina the Argentine League of Protestant Women was organized in 1917, and Methodist women have taken an active part in it from the very beginning with deep devotion to the common cause. It is also noteworthy that the women's societies of our Church have been the first to form a Latin American Confederation uniting all the Methodist women of the continent. They have celebrated three congresses: one in Argentina, another in Chile, and the last in Uruguay. This took place in September 1950 in Montevideo. There were forty-six delegates from nine Latin American countries, and one fraternal delegate from the

United States. This Confederation has been characterized from the beginning by its missionary fervour, and maintains two missionaries in Bolivia and Chile, working among the Indians of those countries. Likewise it has combatted social evils and worked for the welfare of women and children.

Evangelism has been an outstanding characteristic of Methodist work in Latin America. It could not be otherwise, for it is the genius of our denomination. However, numerical results, in many sectors, have not been all that we could have desired, although the influence of our congregations, small as they are, is greater than statistics might suggest. Preaching in general has followed the line of personal salvation in Christ by faith. There has not been much indoctrination of a socio-economical tendency, as a prelude for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. There has been much emotional and sentimental appeal, inevitable in a Church whose ministry has been limited in numbers and preparation. Theological controversies were characteristic of the early years, but at present the spirit of tolerance prevails. The fact is that the ministry is reaching a higher and more uniform cultural and theological level, due in part to the four interdenominational seminaries which have tended to create mutual understanding and respect.

From the statistical data gathered for this study, the following facts become evident: there are in the Methodist churches of Latin America 353 itinerant ministers and 332 non-itinerant (a majority of them laymen); 2,079 organized congregations, of which a third are to be found in Brazil and Mexico (1,174 and 315 respectively)—a third of these congregations have their own more or less adequate places of worship, while the other two-thirds meet in homes or halls adapted for the purpose; in many cases there is no parsonage, and in others parsonages with little comfort or convenience, although this condition is being improved; the membership (active and inactive), including probationers, is between 95,000 and 100,000. These figures would indicate that the Methodist constituency in Latin America, counting children, young people, and sympathizers, would reach at least a quarter of a million. However, statistics can say nothing of the thousands of lives that have contributed to the establishing of our work, persons who have passed on to the glory of the Eternal Kingdom. Nevertheless, our statistics are not to be deprecated.

The Methodist Church, with other Protestant denominations, has had to bear the burden of opposition from the Roman Catholic clergy, which has considered itself the spiritual lord of the inhabitants of Latin America, from colonial times onward, when Spain and Portugal prohibited the entrance of liberal ideas, and the Inquisition punished those who might hold religious ideas different from those of the Roman Church. Those who succeeded in freeing these countries from the Iberian yoke had to struggle against great imperialistic states and clericalism; and many persons, disillusioned with the intransigent, despotic, and retrograde character of official Roman Catholicism, became indifferent and agnostic, and even hostile to religious sentiment, this being especially true among students and professional liberals. Consequently it has been difficult to convince many that Christianity may have any other essence or expression than that to which they have long been accustomed.

The religious education of children and youth has been carried on through 1,818 Sunday-schools and leagues, which have on their rolls some 97,500 pupils.

Perhaps it is here that the Methodist Church in Latin America has been least effective. In some cases it has lacked the necessary agents for maintaining within its sphere of influence the children and youth, and in other cases it has not been concerned to do so. With the emphasis upon mass evangelism and its urgency, children and youth were not always given the place they deserved in the programme of activities nor in the construction of churches. Sometimes we find large churches with no adequate place for carrying out a programme of Christian education. Thus, as someone has said, while stupendous efforts were being made to bring sinners in the door, the children and youth were escaping by way of the windows. There is no doubt but that if we had been able to retain all those who were born in evangelical homes, we would have today three times as many members. Happily we now understand that the future of our Church depends upon giving our best efforts to our children and youth. The process may be slow, but the results will be more solid and satisfactory. Greater emphasis is being given to Christian education, with persons specially dedicated to the preparation and execution of adequate programmes, and the architecture of our churches is being modified to make room for the Lord's 'little lambs'.

The desire of the Methodist Church to educate and instruct the populace has been very intense. Consequently, along with the Protestant tradition of making the Bible accessible to all, it has opened schools wherever the opportunity or the means permitted. In many places, educational work opened the way for the task of evangelism, or at least formed a favourable atmosphere. Nevertheless, this work has been general in its effects, and few of those benefited by these schools have entered our Protestant ranks as militant Christians. We do not really know what this work means for the Kingdom of God, only He knows, but we have the conviction that it means more than we are able to appreciate. But more recently our educators have become determined to place their pupils more directly under the influence of Christ and His Gospel, seeking to secure more decisions for the Church itself. Last year, in Lima, Peru, there was a congress of directors and teachers of our Methodist secondary schools in Latin America. There were representatives of twelve institutions operating in the Spanish language, and a fraternal delegate from Brazil. An Association of Directors of Methodist Schools was organized, with the purpose of meeting periodically to exchange ideas and create norms, all with the idea of discovering the means of making Christian influence more effective in the lives of the students.

There are at least forty-four secondary schools maintained by the Methodist Church in the eleven countries mentioned, with an annual enrolment of 25,000. Brazil, Mexico, Cuba, and Peru, are the most favoured countries, especially the first, which has eighteen of them. Much has been done also in elementary education, although statistics are not available, but in connexion with all the secondary schools there is a primary course; and some schools are only primary, with the addition of a practical commercial course: for example, 'La Escuela Metodista' in San José de Costa Rica, and 'Colegio Americano' in Rosario, Argentina, which in 1950 celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary. There are in Cuba, Costa Rica, Chile, and Bolivia various rural schools (in the two latter especially for the indigenous population). Chile is outstanding with its agricultural school in 'El Vergel', in Angol, where in an excellent plant, experi-

mental work is carried on and young men are prepared to carry this knowledge out over the country.

About thirty-five social centres and medical clinics could be pointed out. 'Institución Sweet', of Santiago, Chile, with its kindergarten and crèche for about eighty pre-school children, various clubs, medical and dental clinics, and mothers' association; 'O Instituto Central do Povo' in Rio de Janeiro, in the poorest section of the city; Friendship House, in the Cerro district of Montevideo, Uruguay; the Boca Mission in Buenos Aires, Argentina—all of which do all within their limited means to remedy the social injustices by which many are bound to an inferior moral and economic level. There are two hospitals: 'El Palmore' in Chihuahua, Mexico, and the 'Clínica Americana' in La Paz, Bolivia. The latter, until recently, and in spite of its limitations, has been the best sanatorium in the country. Both of these hospitals maintain schools of nursing which graduate fifteen or twenty nurses annually. Likewise there are orphanages and homes for the aged, though too little has been done in this field for the needs are great. Something has been done to save the indigenous peoples from the ignorance, misery, exploitation, and spiritual darkness, in which they are submerged. At present most is being done for the Aymaras of Bolivia and the Mapuches of Chile. But we have a long way to go, for there are millions of these native people who long to be 'discovered' as human beings and given the abundant life of which our Lord speaks in His Gospel.

We may say that the Methodist Church in Latin America has only begun its work. There is a long and difficult road ahead. But we do not doubt that, inspired by the love of her Master and Lord, she will go forward with Him, reaping the fruit which He will place within her reach, co-operating with her brethren of other groups round the world to bring to all men the Kingdom of God.

SANTE UBERTO BARBIERI

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Actas Oficiales de la Conferencia Anual del Rio de la Plata de la Iglesia Metodista, año 1950, Imprenta Metodista, Buenos Aires.

Balloch, Enrique C., *Notas personales* sobre la obra en Chile, Costa Rica, Panamá y Perú, año 1950.

Brazil Calls, número 11, Caixa Postal 23, Volta Redonda, Brasil.

Bulletin published by the Association of Directors of Methodist Schools of the Central Conference of Latin America, número 2, August 1950, Cajón 9, La Paz, Bolivia.

General Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Church, 1949, The Methodist Publishing House, U.S.A.

Guerra, Bishop Eleazar, *Informe Episcopal* ante la VI Conferencia General de la Iglesia Metodista de México, Torreón, Coahuila 25-7-1950.

Igreja Metodista do Brasil, Relatorios do Quadrienio 1946-50, Imprensa Metodista, São Paulo, Brasil, 1950.

Methodist Overseas Missions, Gazetteer and Statistics, 1948, Board of Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church, New York.

Mitchell, Pablo D., *Misión y Comision del Metodismo*. Casa Unida de Publicaciones, México; Editorial 'La Aurora', Buenos Aires, 1949.

ORDINATION IN METHODISM

THE PRIMARY sources for the study of ordination in Methodism are of course chiefly *Wesley's Works* and the *Minutes of Conference*. The standard work is John L. Nuelsen, *Die Ordination im Methodismus* (Bremen 1935), to which not a great deal needs to be added. There is a good deal of useful material in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* (referred to as *Proc.*).¹ I am indebted also to a forthcoming work of the Rev. John C. Bowmer, M.A., B.D., containing a chapter on this subject, which I have been permitted to see in typescript.²

I

The Change in Wesley's View in 1746

John Wesley, throughout his whole life, thought that the sacraments should be administered only by those ordained for the purpose;³ his decision to allow laymen to preach did not affect this point.⁴ But in 1746 he changed his mind on the question, who might rightly ordain others to administer the sacraments.⁵ On 20th January he read Lord King's *Account of the Primitive Church*,⁶ from which 'it would follow that bishops and presbyters are (essentially) of one order'.⁷ Years after, when he defended his first ordination (in 1784) in his letter to America, he referred to Lord King in a very similar sentence, adding 'and consequently have the same right to ordain'.⁸ He was also much influenced by Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicon*.⁹ From such sources he derived the conviction which led to his famous statement, made after he had begun to ordain: 'I firmly believe I am a scriptural ἐπίσκοπος as much as any man in England or in Europe; for the *uninterrupted succession* I know to be a fable, which no man ever did or can prove.'¹⁰ Another influence which had led him from the Anglican view of episcopacy was his presence, in 1736, years before he read Lord King, at the ordination of a Moravian Bishop, which much impressed him by its simplicity.¹¹

Wesley's Refusal to Ordain until 1784

Thus from the day when he read Lord King in 1746 Wesley thought he had the right to ordain; or, in the modern Anglican category, that he could ordain validly. Nevertheless, until 1784, despite various crises, he persistently refused to ordain men to administer the sacraments, though he toyed with the idea in

¹ Nuelsen is reviewed in *Proc.* XXI.51-7.

² I have also been assisted by the Rev. Frank Baker, B.A., B.D., and the Rev. Wesley F. Swift.

³ *Letters* (ed. Telford), III.186, 200. *Sermons* (ed. Sugden), II.118-21; *Works* (ed. 3), VII.273-81 (the famous Korah Sermon, about which there is an interesting anecdote in Moore, *Life of Mr Wesley*, II.339-40); *Works*, VIII.224.

⁴ For his view of the status of these lay preachers, cf. *Works*, VIII.218, 224, 300; *Letters*, III.146.

⁵ For his view in 1745, cf. *Letters*, II.55; cf. I.274.

⁶ Wesley thus abbreviates the lengthy title of the original book.

⁷ *Journal* (ed. Curnock), III.232. ⁸ *Letters*, VII.238. ⁹ *ibid.*, III.136, 182; IV.150; VII.21.

¹⁰ *ibid.*, VII.284. In *Works*, XIII.238, he said that he had made this statement 'on Lord King's supposition, that Bishops and Presbyters are essentially one order'. The strongly anti-Methodist writer, F. Hockin, *John Wesley and Modern Methodism* (ed. 4), 47-9, makes much play with the word 'supposition' though the choice of so weak a word was probably accidental, in view of what Wesley says about his convictions on this point elsewhere.

¹¹ *Journal*, I.170-1.

various ways. In 1746 the Conference declined even to 'use more form and solemnity in receiving a new labourer'¹² (that is, in admitting a new Helper); the question of the sacraments was not primarily in their minds. But in 1754 Wesley was on the verge of ordaining by imposition of hands for the administration of the sacraments. Charles Wesley wrote in his shorthand diary for 19th October 1754: 'I was with my brother, who said nothing of [Charles] Perronet [who had administered the Sacrament to a number of preachers] except: "We have in effect ordained already." He urged me to sign the preachers' certificates; was inclined to lay on hands; and to let the preachers administer.'¹³ Charles refused to sign; and the project of ordaining (in the full sense of the word) was dropped. Nevertheless, John's words begin that thin stream of tradition which refers to the admission of the preachers as ordination, even though they were only authorized to preach. In the next year, 1755, in the course of further discussion, John Wesley wrote: 'It is not clear to us that presbyters so circumstanced as we are may *appoint* or *ordain* others.'¹⁴ This is not a denial that presbyters in other circumstances might ordain: in modern Anglican categories, he thought that for him to ordain would be irregular, though valid. Yet in the same year, he uses 'ordination' in another sense, implying that he has ordained, when he writes: 'Whoever is convinced or not convinced, ordination and separation are not the same thing. If so, we have separated already. Herein I am the fifteenth.'¹⁵ The same letter refers to Stillingfleet, and he seems to mean that he has exercised the right of a presbyter to ordain, in the sense that he has appointed preachers. Similarly in *Letters* IV.150, where again he mentions Stillingfleet, he seems to imply, though he does not state, that the preachers had received a valid, though non-episcopal, ordination.

We have some slight evidence of the nature of some of these admissions or so-called 'ordinations'. Thus Cownley was admitted in 1747 with the words: 'Take thou authority to preach the Gospel.'¹⁶ This did not prevent Wesley from ordaining him in 1788. Adam Clarke was similarly admitted in 1782, but did not consider himself ordained.¹⁷ The case of Woodhouse of Owston is more puzzling, because he is said to have been ordained by Wesley and, though only a local preacher, appointed to administer the sacrament.¹⁸ However that may be, the surest proof that Wesley, sustained by his brother, did not perform any ordination, in the full sense of the word, before 1784 is afforded by statements which he and others made in that year, which clearly imply that he was taking a new step.

There were, of course, irregularities; thus, for instance, John Murlin and several other preachers administered the Lord's Supper at Norwich; even the Pastoral Address of 1794 stated: 'Baptism, as well as the burial of the dead, was

¹² John Bennet's *Minutes*, 35.

¹³ Tyerman, *Life and Times of John Wesley*, II.202, n. 1 (my insertions); cf. *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* (1867) 620-1; and Nuelsen, 64, who confuses this with a different sentence in *Letters*, III.136.

¹⁴ *Letters*, III.150.

¹⁵ *ibid.*, III.136. The last sentence is obscure; Telford suggests that it refers to his Nonconformist ancestry on both his father's and mother's side. He seems to be about to ordain in *Letters*, III.147. (*Proc.* VII.20-1.)

¹⁶ *Early Methodist Preachers*, II.7.

¹⁷ Etheridge, *Life of Adam Clarke*, 55. *Proc.* IX.145.

¹⁸ G. Smith, *History of Wesleyan Methodism*, II.12. B. Gregory, *Handbook of Wesleyan Methodist Polity*, 121.

performed by many of the Preachers, long before the death of Mr Wesley, and with his consent.'¹⁹

Attempts to Secure Ordination from Others

It is sometimes alleged that Wesley cannot have been confident of his right to ordain as he sought ordination for his preachers or consecration for himself at the hands of Anglican or Greek bishops; but this was simply because he wished to avoid, if he could, an action which, on any showing, was contrary to Anglican custom.

The following are the main instances.²⁰ He caused Maxfield to be recommended to the Bishop of Londonderry, who agreed to ordain him, saying: 'Mr M—, I ordain you to assist that good man, that he may not work himself to death.'²¹ He obtained ordination for Jones at the hands of the Greek Bishop Erasmus.²² The defence of this which Thomas Olivers made on Wesley's behalf certainly lays some stress on episcopal ordination, and is somewhat hair-splitting. Charles Wesley rejected the ordination, and Jones was afterwards ordained by the Bishop of London. There was an unfortunate sequel to the Greek ordination of Jones. Six of Wesley's preachers obtained a similar ordination without his consent; for this they were expelled from the Society, and the ordinations were deemed invalid, on the ground that they were bought and were in an unknown tongue, the Bishop knowing no English.²³ Wesley's letter of 10th February 1765 shows him in an unhappy mood. He neither affirms nor denies that he had any part in procuring the ordination of Jones, but he seems to defend this ordination on the ground that Jones, unlike the other ordinands, was learned and, in particular, well-versed in languages. He thus presumably understood the ordination in Greek. Nothing is said on the other point at issue: whether fees were paid in this case. One gets the impression that Wesley rather jumps at the point about the foreign language and Jones's learning in order that he may approve the ordination which he had instigated while disowning the others. The letter concludes by mentioning the rumour that Wesley had desired Jones to know of the Bishop if he would consecrate him (Wesley) bishop. On this Wesley says: 'Mr Jones solemnly declares that he never told the Bishop any such thing.'²⁴ But a little later Wesley wrote to the expelled preachers, and broadly hinted that he sympathized with them, but that his hand had been forced by those of his colleagues who were Anglican priests.²⁵ The whole episode perhaps does not show him at his best.²⁶

In 1775 Benson, who was in Scotland, proposed to Fletcher that Wesley and other presbyters should ordain. Fletcher transformed this into a plan for asking the Bishops to ordain, under the threat that if they would not do so, then Wesley would; and, thus amended, the plan went forward to Wesley.²⁷ But nothing came of it, though, as we shall see, Wesley before 1784 made

¹⁹ *Minutes*, I.299.

²⁰ The reference to becoming a bishop in *Letters* V.303 is so vague that nothing can be based on it.

²¹ *Works*, III.131. There is no reason to suppose, as some writers seem to imply, that this formula was used at the actual ordination.

²² Myles, *Chronological History* (ed. 4), 88-9 (also in Smith, I.297-9).

²³ *Letters*, IV.287-90 (11th January, 5th, 10th February, 1765).

²⁴ Hockin, 42, who mentions the rumour, omits this denial. See Myles, loc. cit.

²⁵ *Letters*, IV.291.

²⁶ cf. Nuelsen, 73-6.

²⁷ *Journal*, VIII.328-34. J. S. Simon, *John Wesley: The Last Phase*, 60-8, thinks that the suggestion may have influenced Wesley later.

repeated overtures to the Bishop of London in connexion with America. But none of these schemes involved a doubt of his right to ordain validly.

II

The Ordinations of 1784

What finally induced Wesley²⁸ to take the decisive step was the situation in America, which was far worse than in England. In England the chief difficulty was the reluctance of the Methodists to receive the sacraments at the parish churches, though of course there were also cases where the Methodists were actually repelled. But in America there were 15,000 Methodists and practically no parish churches. There were hardly any Anglican priests, and for years some of the Methodists had administered the sacraments. This had caused the Methodists to split into two parties, and in 1779 one party began to ordain.²⁹ But they were unhappy at the breach, and later agreed to consult Wesley, to whom the other party, under Asbury, had always been loyal. Wesley responded in 1780 by an urgent appeal to the Bishop of London (Dr Lowth) to ordain one man for America.³⁰ He refused, just as the English Anglicans refused to consecrate an Anglican bishop for America. The Anglican episcopal succession in America was first obtained through Scotland.

In 1784 Wesley at last took the decisive step. In February he proposed to Coke that he should ordain him as Superintendent:³¹ this rebuts the suggestion that Wesley was forced into it in his old age by the ambitious importunity of Coke. Coke at first demurred. Wesley laid the matter before the Conference at Leeds, which was decisively opposed to it.³² But on 9th August Coke, who had been studying patristic precedents, wrote strongly in favour of it.³³ This letter refers neither to 'Bishop' nor 'Superintendent', but to 'the power of ordaining others'. Reading between the lines, we seem to see that he was determined to have some power which would be useful to him in dealing with Asbury.

Accordingly, Wesley, on 1st September at 4 a.m. in a private house in Bristol³⁴ ordained the lay travelling preachers Whatcoat and Vasey³⁵ as deacons, being assisted by the Anglican priests, Dr. Coke and Creighton. Next day at the same hour he ordained Whatcoat and Vasey as elders and Dr Coke as Superintendent. For 1st September the Diary has 'ordained', but the printed *Journal*³⁶ has 'appointed'. For 2nd September the Diary has 'ordained Dr Coke', but the *Journal* has 'I added to them three more'; but even this is omitted in one early edition of the *Journal*. We gather, however, with the help

²⁸ He may have been influenced by a non-episcopal ordination of the Countess of Huntingdon's preachers. Nuelsen, 106-8.

²⁹ Nuelsen, 87-8.

³⁰ *Letters*, VII.30-1.

³¹ Etheridge, *Life of Thomas Coke*, 100 (based on Drew, *Life*, 62).

³² Tyerman, III.428. The Conference opposed ordination, though they agreed to send preachers to America. What is the source of the statement in Smith, I.611, that some ministers at Leeds agreed that some should go to America to ordain?

³³ Whitehead, *Life of Wesley*, II.415-17, who says: 'This letter affords matter for several observations, both of the serious and comic kind.'

³⁴ *Proc.* II.99-110.

³⁵ Despite Simon, *op. cit.*, 228, Vasey subsequently received Anglican ordination, but returned later to the itinerancy, and eventually ministered at City Road.

³⁶ VII.15-17.

of Whatcoat's Diary³⁷ that what really happened was what we have stated. The three men subsequently proceeded to America with a letter, dated 10th September 1784, which contains Wesley's defence of his action and deserves careful study,³⁸ as does also Coke's ordination certificate.³⁹ When they arrived in America, a Conference was held at Christmas at Baltimore, which settled the constitution of what Coke hastened to call the Methodist Episcopal Church. Probably Coke thought that Methodism in America could become the leading, or even the sole, episcopal Protestant Church, and hold a position roughly corresponding to that of Anglicanism in England. At the Baltimore Conference, Asbury, who had been nominated by Wesley as joint Superintendent with Coke, but who only accepted the office when it was approved by his brethren, was 'set apart' by Coke, assisted by Whatcoat and Vasey, on 25th December as 'Deacon', on 26th December as 'Elder' and finally on 27th December, with the assistance of a German Reformed⁴⁰ Pastor named Otterbein, as 'Superintendent'.⁴¹ Other ordinations followed.

The Controversy about Coke

That Wesley, deeming a presbyter to be a scriptural *episcopos*, should ordain laymen as elders or presbyters, is intelligible enough; but his action in ordaining Coke, already an Anglican presbyter, as Superintendent is puzzling. In the famous phrase of Whitehead: 'Dr Coke had the same right to ordain Mr Wesley, that Mr Wesley had to ordain Dr Coke.'⁴² The matter is best approached by asking whether Wesley meant 'Superintendent' to be equivalent to 'Bishop'. If not, what did he mean by it? If so, he should have seen the dilemma: either presbyters are Bishops, in which case Coke needed no such ordination; or they are not—in which case, what right had he to ordain? Subsequent events throw light on this question. The American Methodists were soon frequently using the word 'Bishop'. In their *Minutes* of 1785 they attached to Wesley's letter these words: 'As the translators of our version of the Bible have used the word Bishop instead of Superintendent, it has been thought by us that it would appear more scriptural to adopt the term Bishop.'⁴³ In 1788 they decided by a divided vote to admit to their *Minutes* the question: 'Who are the *Bishops* of our Church for the U. States?'⁴⁴ In 1789 it read: 'Who are the persons who exercise the episcopal office in the Methodist Church in Europe and America? *Ans.*: John Wesley, Thomas Coke, and Francis Asbury, by regular order and succession.'⁴⁵ But when Wesley, who had not objected to the earlier stages,⁴⁶ heard that Asbury was thus using the word 'Bishop', which he himself had carefully avoided, he sent him a very sharp letter of rebuke, which included the curious sentence: 'Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.'⁴⁷ But

³⁷ *Proc.* VII.9.

³⁸ *Letters*, VII.238-9.

³⁹ Facsimile at *Journal*, VII.16.

⁴⁰ Or Lutheran? The authorities vary.

⁴¹ The words in inverted commas are taken from the certificate (F. W. Briggs, *Bishop Asbury*, 167-8), in which Coke describes himself as 'Presbyter of the Church of England, and Superintendent of the Methodist Church of America'.

⁴² Whitehead, II.423.

⁴³ *Proc.* VII.10, IV.22. The arrival of the Anglican Bishop Seabury may have suggested this emphasis.

⁴⁴ Nuelsen, 119.

⁴⁵ *Proc.* VII.10; IV.22. Tyerman, III.437.

⁴⁶ American writers thus argue that Wesley did not object to 'episcopal', or to 'Bishop', so long as it was not used as a personal title.

⁴⁷ *Letters*, VIII.91.

against this indignation must be set the fact that in the service-books which he sent in the year 1784 to America⁴⁸ there are forms for the making of deacons, the ordaining of elders, and the ordaining of a Superintendent, which are closely modelled on the Anglican services for the ordination of deacons and priests and for the consecration of Bishops respectively.

What was Wesley's mind? He intended to establish a Church which would neither be presbyterian nor contain 'Bishops'. We cannot doubt that his avoidance of that word was intentional. All the presbyters would have the right to ordain validly; but only some of them would be 'Superintendents' and could ordain regularly. Presumably all the presbyters would be 'scriptural *episcopoi*'; but he might have argued that, though all presbyters might ordain, only Superintendents were *episcopoi*.⁴⁹ He himself was a kind of Superintendent by no formal appointment, but in future, Superintendents would be appointed by ordination. The Church was presbyterian in the sense that the presbyters could ordain validly; but there was no parity of ministers in Church government. This is what he presumably intended for America, and when later (as we shall see) he ordained Mather as Superintendent for England, he must have had something similar in mind.

This at least is what he could have said; but probably he was in some confusion. The whole history of the subject both before and after 1784 suggests that he was in constant uncertainty, and the fact that he avoided the term 'Bishop' was in a sense stultified by his approval of a triple ordination. In broad outline his attitude to the American question was right: he did well in not allowing Anglican tradition to fetter the development of American Methodism; he did well in taking steps to provide America with a regular ministry—but his precise mode of dealing with Coke was bound to lead to confusion.

To ask whether the view that presbyters have the right to ordain is historically sound would take us beyond the bounds of our present discussion. Coke defended the whole transaction in his sermon at the ordination of Asbury, making use of the supposed parallel in the Church of Alexandria, which Wesley had suggested to him in February.⁵⁰ Later Methodist apologists have made use of the assertion of Lightfoot⁵¹ that 'presbyters' and 'Bishops' were originally only different designations of the same office, as is indeed plain in the New Testament. But while this would support the view that Wesley was an '*Episcopos*', it tends to presbyterianism and gives no account of a 'Superintendent'. What was established in America resembled rather a stage intermediate between the apostolic age and the establishment of full diocesan episcopacy, a stage at which one of the presbyters, *primus inter pares*, exercised a certain presidency. We cannot enter here into the bearing on all this of recent controversy on the Apostolic ministry.

What was Coke's mind? It ran on rather different lines from Wesley's. As we have seen, he had pressed for the ordination, though Wesley had first suggested it; he established American Methodism upon episcopal lines: he was subsequently involved in the meeting at Lichfield which tried to make

⁴⁸ *The Sunday Service*, etc. (1784).

⁴⁹ See his hesitation in his *Notes on the New Testament* at Acts 20:17.

⁵⁰ Tyerman, III.436-7. An attack on the sermon is to be found in Whitehead, II.424-30. See also Hampson, *Memoirs*, II.180-216.

⁵¹ *Philippians*, 191.

British Methodism episcopal. Yet he does not seem to have regarded his position as equivalent to that of an Anglican Bishop, for he made various attempts subsequently to obtain Anglican consecration. In his proposal in 1791 to Bishop White he wrote these ambiguous words about what he had received from Wesley: 'He did indeed solemnly invest me, as far as he had a right so to do, with Episcopal authority.'⁵² He proposed also the re-ordination of the ministers. He wrote to the same effect to Bishop Seabury, and also suggested that 'Mr Asbury, our Resident Superintendent' should be consecrated a Bishop.⁵³ He also wrote in 1813 secretly to the Earl of Liverpool, and to William Wilberforce, asking to be appointed 'Bishop in India', in which case he would 'return most fully and faithfully to the bosom of the Established Church'.⁵⁴ One cannot but suspect that he stressed or minimized the title 'Bishop' as was most convenient in each case. Yet when his unfortunate letter to Bishop White became known to the Americans some years later, he wrote to the effect that, though he had then thought that a further consecration would be justifiable if it promoted unity, yet he had always held his consecration of Asbury (and thus, by implication, his own by Wesley) to be valid.⁵⁵

To conclude the account of the events closely related to the ordination of Coke, it remains to say that a great deal of opposition was aroused in English Methodism when the news got out.⁵⁶ In 1785, after further ordinations, his brother Charles was prominent in opposition, quoting the words of Lord Mansfield that ordination is separation.⁵⁷ The harshest words of Charles were perhaps:

*So easily are Bishops made
By man's or woman's whim;
Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,
But who laid hands on him?*

The kindest were:

'Twas age that made the breach, not he.⁵⁸

John replied in a couple of letters.⁵⁹

Ordinations from 1785 to Wesley's Death

We must now examine Wesley's later ordinations. As there is an easily accessible list, more recent than Nuelsen, it is not necessary to go into details here.⁶⁰ There were at least twenty-seven cases altogether, including the three we have discussed. In 1785 he ordained for Scotland.⁶¹ A defence of this was published in the *Minutes* for 1786.⁶² Some of the brethren ordained for Scotland

⁵² Hockin, 183-7.

⁵³ *idem*, 187-92.

⁵⁴ *idem*, 193-7. Nuelsen, 121. For a defence of Coke, see A. W. Harrison, *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion*, 175.

⁵⁵ Nuelsen, 121-2. Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, IV.443-4.

⁵⁶ cf. the letter quoted in Whitehead, II.419-20. For Whitehead's own strong hostility, see 418, 436-8.

⁵⁷ *idem*, 430-7. Tyerman, III.448.

⁵⁸ Whitehead, 423.

⁵⁹ *Letters*, VII.284-5, 288-9.

⁶⁰ The list is in *Proc.* XXIV.76-80, with one addition on 103. Add also XXV.47-8, XXVI.16. For ordinations by others than Wesley, see XXIV.101-3, XXVI.30-1.

⁶¹ The *Journal* has 'set apart'; the *Diary* 'ordained'. *Journal*, VII.101.

⁶² *Minutes*, I.189-91. The account of this in Harrison, *The Separation of Methodism from the Church of England*, 17, seems to be a paraphrase. On his comments, see a correction in W. F. Swift, *Methodism in Scotland*, 55.

in 1785 or later continued to exercise ministerial functions after they had returned to England. Wesley, who addressed them as 'Reverend' only when they were in Scotland, protested at this, with varying results.⁶³ In 1786 occurred the first ordinations for the mission field other than America. Also in this year, Wesley, who was usually assisted only by Anglican priests, included in the presbytery Pawson, whom he had himself ordained in 1785.⁶⁴ There were ordinations in 1787, but no new step till 1788.

The ordination of Mather on 6th and 7th August 1788⁶⁵ was remarkable in two ways. It was the first ordination for England; and Mather was ordained Superintendent, no doubt in order to preserve the succession for England, though in fact others performed this function, and Mather did not. The special nature of the occasion is said to be marked by an exclamation mark in the Diary for 7th August 1788; but this is not uncommon at ordinations.⁶⁶ The point does not seem to have been much discussed whether Mather was ordained successively as deacon, elder, and Superintendent. It was not Wesley's custom to ordain *per saltum*, i.e. to omit a stage, nor was any stage omitted in the ordinations of Asbury; but hitherto Wesley had never had to perform more than two steps, making men successively deacons and elders; for of course the only Superintendent whom he had hitherto ordained (Coke) had been a presbyter already. But in the Diary the ordination of Mather is only referred to on *two* successive days.⁶⁷ It seems probable that on 6th August Wesley ordained Mather as deacon, and on 7th August either ordained him as Superintendent *per saltum* or ordained him as elder with some indication that he was thereby appointed Superintendent.⁶⁸

In 1789 Wesley ordained Rankin, who was a supernumerary, and Moore. These were for England, and now the word 'presbyter' appears on the certificate instead of 'elder': Moore's certificate contains the words 'to administer the Sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper according to the usage of the Church of England'.⁶⁹

These were Wesley's last ordinations. In 1790, in Wesley's presence, Coke laid his right hand on the heads of eleven or twelve preachers, and handed to them the *Large Minutes*; but this seems to have been merely a way of receiving some of the preachers into Full Connexion, though Sutcliffe, who was one of them, on whose testimony the narrative rests, wrote: 'This was ordination in every view . . . through it was not called ordination, what else could it be?'⁷⁰ The thin stream of tradition which described reception into Full Connexion as 'ordination' was thus continued.

It is sometimes asserted that Wesley repented of what he had done, and took steps to counteract it. Hampson adduces no evidence; Tyerman reports it on the authority of Creighton.⁷¹

⁶³ *Letters*, VIII.105, 129, 279. Harrison, op. cit., 33-5. Tyerman, III.574-6 (letters of Hanby).

⁶⁴ Harrison, op. cit., 18.

⁶⁵ Unaccountably ascribed by Smith, I.547, to 1787; cf. Myles, 175.

⁶⁶ *Journal*, VII.423. Harrison, op. cit., 21, implies that the status of Mather as a Superintendent rests wholly on the evidence of Myles, 175; but, apart from other evidence, it is confirmed (as Harrison, 39, says) by what Mather said to the Conference of 1791, as related in a letter of Pawson (Smith, II.98. Tyerman, III.443).

⁶⁷ The notes on the *Journal* assume too much when they say: 'It is also certain that on Aug. 6 Wesley ordained Alexander Mather, deacon, and, on the day following, presbyter.' *Journal*, VII.421 n.2.

⁶⁸ The certificate is missing.

⁶⁹ Facsimile at *Journal*, VII.504.

⁷⁰ *Proc.* XV.60.

⁷¹ Hampson, II.216; Tyerman, III.441 n.1.

It must also be added that Pawson ordained elders in the Scottish sense, which incurred Wesley's grave displeasure.

III

The Conferences from 1791 to 1795

It will be well here to consider the alignment of the parties after Wesley's death in 1791. The 'Church Methodists' or 'High Church' party were in favour of continuing in the Church of England, and were thus opposed to the use of ministerial dress, titles, and so on, by the Methodist preachers, and were against their ordination. (It is important to notice this point, because a generation later a 'High Church' Methodist was one who supported these things, as asserting the ecclesiastical status of the Methodists.) Ranged against them was the party which included most of the congregations, but also many of the preachers, and particularly most of those who had been themselves ordained, such as Coke and Moore. Their chief wish was to have the sacrament administered by the preachers, whether ordained by the imposition of hands or not; but many of them desired the preachers to be ordained by the imposition of hands; and some even wished the Methodist Church to be episcopal. For convenience I shall call them the 'Separatists'. The question about ordination was on the whole subordinate to the question whether the preachers, ordained and unordained alike, should administer the Lord's Supper; and the decisions on the latter point have been variously interpreted in their bearing on ordination.⁷³

At first there were several ordinations (by the Separatists) at District Meetings;⁷⁴ but ordinations without the consent of the Conference were forbidden by the Conference of 1792,⁷⁵ which also decided that the Lord's Supper should not be administered for a year except in London; this applied even to the clergy of the Church of England who were working with them.⁷⁶ This was clearly a victory for the 'Church Methodists'.

In 1793 the administration of the Lord's Supper was reluctantly admitted in certain cases, and it was decided that 'the distinction between ordained and unordained preachers shall be dropped'.⁷⁷ Atmore, in an account written at the time,⁷⁷ adds to this these words: 'and that being received into Full Connexion by the Conference, and appointed by them to administer the ordinances, should be considered a sufficient ordination, without the imposition of hands.' These words do not occur in the *Minutes*. Thus begins a line of Methodist apologetic which has continued ever since. It is asserted that the admission into Full Connexion is virtually ordination; and I shall refer to it as the 'virtual ordination' theory. We have already seen that there is a thin line of tradition, even in Wesley's lifetime, which uses the word 'ordination' for the admission of a preacher. This theory survived, as we shall see, after the

⁷³ The most convenient recent summary of this period, which is discussed in all the Histories, is A. W. Harrison, *The Separation of Methodism from the Church of England*; but I differ from him in some details.

⁷⁴ Smith, II.16; *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* (1845), 214-16; (1867), 626.

⁷⁵ *Minutes*, I.259-60.

⁷⁶ *ibid.* 263.

⁷⁷ *ibid.* 278. It was carried by 86 votes to 48.

⁷⁷ See *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* (1845), 220-1; cf. Smith, II.22-4, 235; Nuelsen, 137 (but his notes 15 and 16 are erroneous references).

general resumption of imposition of hands in 1836; and even in our time it has still sometimes been said that the real Methodist equivalent of the hands laid on in other Churches in ordination is the hands raised to vote the brethren into Full Connexion.⁷⁸ What are we to make of this argument? In a broad sense it is true: the Methodist preachers did come, by gradual stages, in the providence of God, to exercise all the functions of the Christian ministry. But as an interpretation of the decision of 1793 it is a distortion. One would gather from Atmore that the Conference took a decisive step and asserted the ministerial status of the preachers; but the words which he adds to those in the *Minutes* are surely his own gloss on the decision. They are not clear in themselves, for they do not make it plain whether the virtual ordination really resides in reception into Full Connexion or in being appointed to administer the ordinances, which were by no means conjoined in that year as they came to be afterwards. But his interpretation is further precluded by the fact that the same Conference forbade gowns, cassocks, bands, surplices, and the title 'Reverend'; and stated, 'We have never sanctioned ordination in England,' and said that it desired to be united to the Church of England 'as a body at large', despite the 'deviation' into which in some places it was forced concerning the Lord's Supper.⁷⁹ This was not an assertion of the ministerial status of the preachers, but an assertion that ordination (which the Conference used in the normal sense of 'ordination by the imposition of hands') was not necessary, in the last resort, for the administration of the Lord's Supper. Yet Atmore's attempt to make the most of the slight ground which the Separatists had gained has been echoed by many supporters of the 'virtual ordination' theory, as for instance Smith, who uses a phrase of masterly ambiguity: 'equivalent to real or formal ordination.'⁸⁰

So far the Separatists had not made much headway. The first President chosen after Wesley's death was one who had not even been ordained deacon; Coke was again and again kept out of the Presidency; the claims of Mather to ordain had been coldly received by the Conference of 1791.⁸¹ Pawson, writing in 1793, goes so far as to say: 'I sincerely wish that Dr Coke and Mr Mather may be allowed to be what they are, Bishops.'⁸²

The Separatists then conspired together in the Lichfield Plan, which would have made British Methodism episcopal. This was rejected by the Conference of 1794⁸³ 'as tending to create invidious and unhallowed distinctions among brethren'.⁸⁴ In fact, the Conference made no decisive change, though Smith gives an account of it in support of the 'virtual ordination' theory;⁸⁵ he here asserts this theory to have been the argument of Benson at the Conference of 1791, which appears to be inconsistent with his own account of 1791⁸⁶ and with Benson's whole position.

⁷⁸ Now done, in any case, by a standing vote.

⁷⁹ *Minutes*, I.277-81.

⁸⁰ Smith, II.235; cf. 679. Gregory, *Handbook of Wesleyan Methodist Polity*, 126. *Proc.* XVI.150 also supports 'virtual ordination' with indefensible suggestions.

⁸¹ But in 1794 at Lichfield, Mather was a moderating influence on the reformers.

⁸² Smith, II.98.

⁸³ Harrison, *op. cit.* 48 (who supports the 'virtual ordination' theory) ascribes to the Conference of 1794 a number of resolutions which were merely reaffirmed from 1793.

⁸⁴ Smith, II.101. What is the primary source? It is not in the *Minutes*.

⁸⁵ *ibid.*

⁸⁶ *ibid.*, II.13.

In 1795, after grave disturbances at Bristol,⁸⁷ the Conference passed the Plan of Pacification, 'a compromise which worked against conservatives,'⁸⁸ which conceded to the Separatists most of what they asked about the Lord's Supper, but without any reference to ordination.⁸⁹ Apart from an unsuccessful attempt of Coke in 1798-9 to secure Anglican ordination for the Methodists,⁹⁰ the matter was left there for some time.

Ordination by Imposition of Hands from 1792 to 1836

It must not, however, be supposed that there were no ordinations by imposition of hands between 1792 and 1836. There is at least one case (Braithwaite) of an ordination for Scotland.⁹¹ Moreover, the custom gradually grew—'one does not quite know how'⁹²—of laying hands on men going overseas: such an ordination by Atmore was seen by Hoole in 1819.⁹³ It was thought until recently that there were no cases for England, but one has recently been discovered. In 1808 Coke, who describes himself as 'Bishop' on the Certificate, ordained Ogilvie, who was going to Chester.⁹⁴ Why an exception was made in his case we cannot say.

Meanwhile, for all ministers, the reception into Full Connexion was made more impressive. Sometimes it lasted as long as three hours, and once at least parts of the Anglican service for the ordination of priests was used.⁹⁵ Thus the 'virtual ordination' theory gained ground, despite the fact that some missionaries underwent both reception into Full Connexion and ordination by imposition of hands.⁹⁶ But, side by side with this, the proposal that ordination by imposition of hands should be used for all ministers was frequently made: the topic was mentioned in 1818, 1822, 1824, and 1828, and in 1836 the proposal was carried.⁹⁷

IV

Procedure before 1836

It is necessary to consider the procedure just before 1836 in order to see what difference was then made. In 1835 the service, a Conference session, was called 'Ordination'; the resolution was carried by a standing vote, and the President said: 'The Conference authorizes me to say, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, that you are now received into Full Connexion with this body'⁹⁸—a somewhat meagre formula for ordination. Moreover, the missionaries who had already been ordained by imposition of hands and had afterwards been virtually received into Full Connexion *in absentia* were formally received into Full Connexion; and this seems hardly to have been distinguished from the 'Ordination' of the ordinary candidates.

⁸⁷ It is not always made sufficiently clear in this connexion that the reason why Vasey's ministrations were acceptable in places where Moore's were not was that, though they had both been ordained by Wesley, Vasey had subsequently received Anglican ordination.

⁸⁸ Harrison, *op. cit.* 56.

⁸⁹ *Minutes*, I.322-5.

⁹⁰ Nuelsen, 139-40; Smith II.301-3; S. Drew, *Life of Coke*, 293.

⁹¹ *Proc.* XV.78-9, XXIV.101-3. The latter article says that ordinations for England were stopped by the 1793 Conference. This should surely be 1792.

⁹² Townsend, *etc.*, *New History*, I.405; Nuelsen, 142-3 (who gives the previous reference wrongly).

⁹³ *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* (1867), 619.

⁹⁴ *Proc.* XXVI.30-1.

⁹⁵ Nuelsen, 140-1. *Life of Clarke*, by a member of his family, II.96-7, III.67-8.

⁹⁶ *Proc.* XVI.152.

⁹⁷ Nuelsen, 143.

⁹⁸ *Watchman* (1835), 253.

The change in 1836

In 1836 the President (Bunting) asked whether he should omit the ancient practice of imposition of hands: the 'virtual ordination' theory was unchallenged in the debate, as it had been in 1822.⁹⁹ It was expressed in 1836 in various interesting ways. Bunting said he was 'in essence' ordained himself. Galland used the phrase: 'When the Conference, by the Plan of Pacification, invested our societies with the privilege of becoming Christian churches . . .' Marsden said that the hand of God had ordained those who had not received imposition of hands; and France said that he believed in *this* apostolical succession that the ministry appointed the ministry.¹⁰⁰

The motion that the men to be admitted into Full Connexion be ordained by imposition of hands¹⁰¹ was carried with two dissentients, and the ordination was held with a traditional formula very unlike that of 1835. The service was called 'Ordination or Admission to Full Connexion of Probationers'. The formal reception into Full Connexion of ordained missionaries was carefully distinguished from it. Obviously at some later date, reception into Full Connexion and ordination were separated, and the present practice inaugurated whereby all those to be received (who include, beside those to be ordained on that day, Welsh preachers and sometimes military chaplains already ordained, all of whom are normally present, and missionaries serving overseas, who are absent) are received into Full Connexion by a vote of the Conference, which includes the resolution that those who are not already ordained or to be ordained should be ordained by imposition of hands the same evening. This separation of the two ceremonies makes it almost impossible to maintain that reception is now 'virtual ordination', and one wonders what Bunting would have said of it. But the theory lingers on in the assertion sometimes made that reception is the more important of the two.

It was asserted by Harrison,¹⁰² as a matter of sentimental interest, that Henry Moore took part in this ordination in 1836, thus preserving a sort of succession, in which Harrison thought he stood himself. But, in fact, Moore took no part in 1836,¹⁰³ and wrote in the next year to the President, claiming that he was the only person surviving who had received the power from Wesley to ordain for England 'when the time should come'.¹⁰⁴ But an alternative line for the sentimentalists has passed almost unnoticed. Atmore (who was ordained by Wesley in 1786 for Scotland) himself ordained by imposition of hands in 1819 Shaw, who was President in 1865.¹⁰⁵

v

This concludes the main historical account: but several matters must be briefly added.

⁹⁹ *Proc.* XVI.150. A favourite way of putting this was that the imposition of hands was but a *circumstance* of ordination.

¹⁰⁰ *Watchman* (1836), 251ff. The brevity of the reference in Gregory (*Sidelights*, 220), is remarkable. Gregory, *Handbook of Wesleyan Methodist Polity*, 215, has a curious defence of the 'virtual ordination' theory by reference to the *Didache*.

¹⁰¹ *Minutes* (1836), VIII.85.

¹⁰² *The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion*, 172. *Proc.* XXIV.103. ¹⁰³ *Watchman*, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁴ Mrs. Richard Smith, *Life of Henry Moore*, 326 (cited in *Proc.* IX.154). Of course, Moore may conceivably have ordained in a subsequent year.

¹⁰⁵ *Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* (1867), 619-20.

Other Traditions

Hitherto, we have considered only the British Wesleyan tradition, together with the American, and the latter only in so far as that throws light on the minds of Wesley and Coke. It is much to be desired that someone should write an account of the traditions of those Churches which united with the Wesleyan Methodist Church to form the Methodist Church in 1932.

The British Wesleyan tradition may also be more fully compared with the American Methodist episcopal tradition. After the Baltimore Conference of 1784, the travelling preachers were not all ordained immediately; but gradually they came to be ordained (by the imposition of hands): the succession conveyed by Coke was maintained without a gap, and thus the 'virtual ordination' theory was never needed in America. The threefold ministry is still maintained: candidates are admitted into Full Connexion (by a formal vote set in a solemn act of worship) and are ordained deacon in the same year; but they are normally (I believe) not ordained elders until two years later. But in German Methodism, which is part of the same Church, there is now no diaconate, and men are ordained elders in the year in which they are admitted into Full Connexion.¹⁰⁶ In episcopal Methodism local preachers are sometimes ordained, that they may administer the sacraments,¹⁰⁷ and continue to be 'laymen', as that word is defined, not as one who is not an ordained minister, but as one who is not in Full Connexion with a Conference. British Methodism also has laymen who are authorized to administer the Lord's Supper, but they are not ordained.

Moreover, American Methodism is still episcopal: it strongly affirms that episcopacy is not another order of the ministry; presbyters and bishops are of the same order, but the Bishops have a different office (even when they have retired from office!).¹⁰⁸ Stress is now laid on the fact that, whereas deacons and presbyters are ordained, Bishops (like deaconesses in America) are simply consecrated: but the use of the word 'consecrate' in this connexion may be simply a reversion to the word which the Anglicans use in the case of Bishops, the very word which was so carefully avoided when Coke was set apart and Asbury ordained and Wesley wrote *The Sunday Service*. The wheel has come full circle. Moreover (as in *The Sunday Service*), the formula for a Bishop so closely resembles that for a presbyter that it is very hard to see that the one is an ordination and the other not.¹⁰⁹ And the use of the word 'order' in connexion with the presbyterate is itself unfamiliar to British minds. Let us hope that at some ecumenical meeting our American and Continental brethren will expound to us their most recent thought on these subjects.

It has also been necessary to omit the ordination or consecration of deaconesses.

Liturgy

There is also need for a fuller consideration of the ordination service. Nuelsen (146-57) can now be supplemented by Nola B. Harmon, *Rites and Ritual of*

¹⁰⁶ Nuelsen's book was written to secure this.

¹⁰⁷ As deacons they may administer only Baptism; as elders they may administer also the Lord's Supper—P.S.W.

¹⁰⁸ Nuelsen, 126-8.

¹⁰⁹ The vital words are: 'The Lord pour upon thee the Holy Spirit for the office and work of a Bishop (or an elder).' But nothing is said to the Bishop corresponding to 'Take thou authority as an elder'.

Episcopal Methodism, and the whole subject could be brought up to date by a consideration of the *Book of Offices* of 1936. More attention should be paid to the way in which the Wesleyan service which was used until 1936 contained portions of all three Anglican services, namely those for deacons, priests, and Bishops, possibly in order to assert that the single ministry was not simply equivalent to the Anglican presbyterate, but that in Methodism, as in the New Testament, presbyters are also *episcopoi*.

Moreover, the ordination service is not to be too sharply severed from the procedure which precedes it, such as the public examination of ordinands, now called public testimony of ordinands. In the Wesleyan Church this was held in or near the Conference town, almost as part of the ordination; but it is now held in the Districts. It was desired to keep something in the hands of the Synods, as the ordination itself was in the Primitive Methodist Church. But this is only one of a long series of stages from the beginnings of candidature onward which influence the Methodist doctrine of the ministry.

Theology

More consideration needs also to be given to the theological conclusions to be drawn from these facts. Nuelsen's conclusions¹¹⁰ do not appear to me entirely sound.

We have discussed the American episcopacy, but who are the Bishops in British Methodism? The liturgy seems somewhat to imply that all the presbyters are Bishops. But W. B. Pope¹¹¹ says that 'the Superintendent in English Methodism occupies precisely the position of early episcopacy'. These two views go back to divergent views about the New Testament episcopacy. It is also sometimes asserted that Chairmen of Districts perform the essential functions of Bishops.

Again, the 'virtual ordination' theory has its obvious weaknesses. If an attempt is made to state it strictly, it must go something like this: from 1793 (or 1795? or when?) to 1835 inclusive, reception into Full Connexion was in England (but not in America) an act of ordination (except for men going overseas). Not by such means can Methodism be defended. It is more honest to admit that Wesleyan Methodism evolved slowly from a society to a Church, and that it is not possible to say exactly when it (or the other branches of Methodism) began to be a Church, or its travelling preachers began to be presbyters, or to define precisely what was or was not an ordination. But what is clear is that from 1836 onward Wesleyan Methodism ordained by imposition of hands with the full intention of doing what the Church does.¹¹² The questions, What makes Methodism a Church? and What the Church does in ordaining Ministers? lie outside the scope of this discussion.

Dr. Platt is right when he says: 'For the majority this evangelical view, that the power of ordination resides in the living Church in fellowship with its living Head and is not dependent on any historical succession, episcopal or presbyterial, has won common consent.'¹¹³ That Methodism is now a Church does not depend on the validity of what was done in 1784 or 1795 or 1835: On quite other grounds, we assert that Methodism is a Church: and being a Church, both can and does ordain.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

¹¹⁰ op. cit. 158-66. ¹¹¹ *Compendium*, III.358-9. ¹¹² I am here discussing only Wesleyan Methodism.

¹¹³ *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* (January 1936), 73.

Notes and Discussions

SOME RECENT CONTINENTAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

WE CLOSED the brief chronicle last year with a reference to the valuable service which Professor K. L. Schmidt of Basel is rendering to biblical and theological scholarship by editing, in company with the other members of the theological faculty of that University, the bi-monthly periodical *Theologische Zeitschrift*.

In the January number R. Mordenthaler writes about Form Criticism and the exposition of the Parables. In the May number Eduard Schweizer has a most important essay, inquiring into those sections of Luke which are marked by Hebraisms, and working out a theory which would postulate a special source used by that Evangelist. The September number has an interesting account by Professor W. G. Kümmel of the discussions which have arisen out of Bultmann's essay (that appeared in 1941) on the mythological element in the New Testament. If the last is of greatest significance for the theologian, Eduard Schweizer's essay has profoundly important suggestions for those who are trying to trace as far back as possible the written sources used by our Evangelists. For that reason a brief account must be attempted of this latest contribution to the solution of the Synoptic Problem.

It is well known that one of the peculiarities of the Lucan writings is that, though the author normally writes some of the most literary Greek to be found in the New Testament, there are many passages in the Gospel and in the earlier part of Acts where the style is that of translation Greek. In reporting the sayings of Jesus which were originally spoken in Aramaic this is only to be expected. But Luke, unlike the other Evangelists, has nests of Hebraisms, which are peculiar to his Gospel. This has led Prof. Schweizer to make a most careful linguistic investigation into the distribution of these Hebraisms throughout the two Lucan writings. The result of his research must be given in a very short summary. (a) There was a collection of miracle-stories (W), ending with Peter's confession, the transfiguration, the healing that followed, and the earliest prediction of the Passion (i.e. approximately what we find in Matthew 8:1-9, 34, 16:13-17, 28). (b) This collection was probably already available for Mark, who then took over these narratives but first described the incidents which took place in and around Capernaum, and only later on connected them with the journey across the lake. Matthew then read Mark and W side by side. We may conjecture that he followed Mark not very closely, but in matters of arrangement and sequence, as in some details, was influenced rather by W. (c) A Greek-writing predecessor of Luke (H) combined W with what we regard as the 'special Lucan narratives'. Let these be called S. It is his writing that is characterized by the Hebraisms that have led to this investigation. (d) Luke follows Mark in his outline and wording, but fills in Mark and corrects it often according to H, to whom he owes his special material. The same process can be proved for Luke's method elsewhere.

Schweizer shows that this theory (which is thrown out as a basis for further

discussion) on one side seems to come near the 'Urmarkus' theory of earlier days, but is limited only to a relatively small portion of Mark. On the other side it approximates to Streeter's Proto-Luke, with this difference, that Schweizer's 'Proto-Luke' is to be distinguished from the author of the Gospel in its final form, and it is not Q but W that was combined with the Lucan 'special source' to form 'Proto-Luke'.

It is to be hoped that Schweizer will publish his article in an extended form so that many who cannot read it in this Swiss periodical will be able to examine the data and the arguments based upon them, in order to discover whether a valuable addition has been made to the literature dealing with the origin of the Gospels.

Before leaving periodical literature I should call attention to two articles in the *Revue Biblique* for January and April 1950, which deserve mention: 'The Eschatological Synthesis of St Matthew' (by A. Feuillet) and 'The Philonism of the Epistle to the Hebrews' (by R. P. C. Spicq). At the same time I ought to say that the reviews of books on New Testament subjects in this admirable periodical are amongst the most reliable and competent to be found anywhere. One of the outstanding New Testament scholars in Germany today is Professor Joachim Jeremias of Göttingen, who occupies the chair held a generation ago by Wilhelm Bousset. Two books of his have recently come to hand. The first is an entirely new edition of *Die Abendmahlsworte*, which first appeared in 1935. In its original form this book set out to deal with three questions: (1) Was the Last Supper a passover meal? (2) What is the oldest form of the text of the words of Jesus spoken at the Supper? (3) What did those words mean? He answered these questions as follows: (1) Yes. (2) Luke 22¹⁵⁻¹⁶, Mark 14^{25, 22, 24}. (3) The Lord's Supper was not only an acted parable of instruction but also a gift, in which the disciples were to share in the atoning virtue of the death of Jesus. It was a dramatic act, possessing at the same time an effective character. When we turn to the new edition we find that Jeremias finds even stronger reasons for treating the Last Supper as a passover meal. He gives the calculations of several astronomers to show that the balance of probability favours the Synoptic date rather than the Johannine, i.e. that in the years A.D. 27 to 34 the 15th rather than the 14th Nisan fell on the Friday in the year 30, which on other grounds is said to be the likeliest year for the death of Christ. If the year 33 were acceptable, then the 14th Nisan fell on Friday, but this year is said to be ruled out on general chronological grounds. Yet it is admitted that in the year 30 the 14th Nisan can possibly have been a Friday. So this astronomical argument does not prove the point. The arguments on which Jeremias chiefly relies for his identification of the Last Supper with the passover have been summarized in an essay which he contributed to the *Journal of Theological Studies*, January-April 1949. He shows immense erudition in all the literature, ancient and modern, that throws any light upon the rules and usages relating to the passover. What he does not explain is the complete absence in any of our sources of any reference to the eating of the paschal lamb. This weakens his otherwise confident dismissal of Oesterley and all the other scholars who explain the problem by positing a special *Qiddush*, or meal, for the sanctification of the passover. Of course, if Jesus knew that His death would take place before the evening when the passover would be celebrated, He would adapt this meal

to the needs of the occasion, and no analogy will account perfectly for the form it took. The second chapter is entirely new, and discusses the description of the Supper in the framework of the narrative of the Passion. It is in the third chapter that Jeremias makes the most striking departure from his former position. He now accepts the originality of the longer text in the Lucan account. At the same time he regards the Marcan record as giving the oldest form of the words of institution, and adds some interesting evidence of Semitisms and Palestinian peculiarities in the Greek of Mark's story. Even those who remain unconvinced by the defence of the Marcan as against the Pauline-Johannine date of the crucifixion must be profoundly grateful for the vast learning which contributes so much to our understanding of the entire question.

A brochure by the same writer has put in an entirely new light the passage in John 5¹⁻⁹ about the healing of the cripple at the pool. In recent years it has become a matter of general agreement that textual evidence requires the reading Bethzatha rather than Bethesda. Professor Jeremias has so marshalled the textual evidence, and has made such lively use of the archaeological discoveries of the last few generations that we must now reconsider the question not only of the name, but the location of the pool. He has convinced the present writer that the name was Bethesda and that Bethzatha got into the text of many early MSS. through confusion with the name of the northern suburb of Jerusalem. Excavations have uncovered a large trapezium-shaped pool, divided by a broad wall. The 'five porches' were round the four sides and on this wall, which like the other four had its colonnade. An inscription shows that when Jerusalem had become a pagan city, Aelia Capitolina, this pool was regarded as having magical properties of healing. No doubt the colonnades belong to the Herodian period of decorative architecture, and the supposed curative property of the water after intermittent disturbance gave rise to the name 'House of Mercy' for this erection about the pool. The story of the successive excavations, and the photographs illustrating the site, add greatly to the interest roused by the acute discussion of the textual evidence for John 5². While referring to the text of the New Testament I must not omit to mention two important contributions, both written in English but published abroad. Professor A. J. B. Higgins, of New College, London, has written a scholarly essay which appears in the January number of *Vigiliae Christianae*, a review of early Christian life and language, published by the North-Holland Publishing company at Amsterdam. It is entitled 'The Latin Text of Luke in Marcion and Tertullian'. Those who have Hans von Soden's essay on 'The Latin Text of Paul in Marcion and Tertullian' in Jülicher's *Festschrift* will be most grateful to Dr Higgins for carrying the task forward into the text of Marcion's *Gospel*. It is a valuable addition to what had already been done to the *Apostle*. Harnack and Blackman have turned our attention to Marcion and his text. The relation between Marcion and the Western Text deserves the fullest study. At the same time an unexpected light has been turned on the Syriac text. Professor Arthur Vööbus, formerly Professor of Ecclesiastical History of the Theological Faculty at the University of Tartu, Estonia, is now in the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Chicago. Those who know what happens when Russian communism takes a people in its ruthless grip will not be surprised when they read what this learned Professor has suffered. His University was deprived of their

professors who are scattered abroad. His long years of preparation for writing the whole history of the text of the New Testament on Syriac ground have been interrupted. He and his wife were driven from their home and escaped with such manuscripts and scientific material as they could carry with them. In a Displaced Persons' camp he has managed to write this remarkable pamphlet in English: *Researches on the Circulation of the Peshitta in the Middle of the Fifth Century*. For the last half-century Burkitt's proof that the Peshitta was produced by Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa, in 411, and that it immediately superseded all the Old Syriac texts, has remained unchallenged. Now this Estonian scholar has proved not only that the older texts were not suppressed or even superseded, but that Rabbula himself, when translating Cyril of Alexandria's work 'On the Orthodox Faith' into Syriac, does not always quote the Peshitta when rendering Cyril's scripture quotations into Syriac. This is but one of many contributions that Professor Vööbus has made to the study of the Syriac Bible. Several of them are in English and can be obtained from the Baltic University, Pinneberg. (While this article was in the press I have received the January-February number of *Theologische Zeitschrift* with an important article by Professor Vööbus, describing the newly discovered textual material for the Old Syriac version.)

Maurice Goguel is the most famous living representative of French Protestant scholarship in the New Testament field. Though a liberal critic his views are never fantastic as were those of Guignebert and Loisy in his later stage. On his seventieth birthday a large number of scholars of various nationalities contributed to a volume of essays: *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*. It would take up too much space to give even the titles of the twenty-seven essays. A few of the more important can be indicated. Pierre Benoit writes on the 'summaries' in Acts 2-5, Bultmann on 'The Problem of the Relation of Theology to Preaching in the New Testament', Oscar Cullmann on 'The Life of Jesus as the Object of "Seeing" and of "Believing", according to the Fourth Gospel', F. C. Grant on 'The Impracticability of the Gospel Ethics', Joachim Jeremias on 'The Problem of the Meaning of Isaiah 53 in the late Judaism of Palestine', T. W. Manson on 'Some Reflexions on Apocalyptic', Bo Reicke on 'The New Testament Conception of Reward', Eduard Schweizer on 'The Interpretation of the Cross in R. Bultmann', and C. Soicq on 'The Johannine Origin of the Conception of Christ as Priest in the Epistle to the Hebrews'. There is a rich and varied fare offered to the reader of this interesting book.

Twelve years ago the lamented Martin Dibelius wrote a little book, *Jesus*, for the series 'Sammlung Göschen'. At the time of his death three years ago he left six chapters and part of the seventh chapter in manuscript for a companion booklet on Paul. At the request of his widow, Professor G. W. Kümmel of Zürich revised this part and added the three and a half chapters that were needed to complete the author's plan. Martin Dibelius's many friends in this land as well as a host of friends on the continent will value this little pocket volume as the legacy of a distinguished New Testament scholar, who was also endeared to them by the warmth of his affection.

W. F. HOWARD

MONSIGNOR KNOX'S *ENTHUSIASM*

ENTHUSIASM,¹ by R. A. Knox is a large book and, in its way, a learned one. That is to say, it embodies the results of very wide reading, but the range is so extensive that minute and detailed scholarship is not to be looked for, as it might be if the volume were simply a treatise on a single subject like Montanism or Jansenism. But when the survey includes every religious movement that can be classed as 'enthusiasm' from the second century to the twentieth, that is not possible. It illustrates the complexity of the subject that there must be already two qualifications of the last sentence. Monsignor Knox uses the word 'enthusiasm' as it was used in the eighteenth century in attacks upon Methodism, practically in the sense of fanaticism, and this is to be regretted, as a degradation of a noble word. And it is only those movements of 'enthusiasm' that broke with Rome that are criticized and condemned here. The early Franciscans were guilty of some of the very extravagances that were later committed by the early Quakers, but there is no criticism of the Friars, and not very much of the Spirituals, with all their apocalyptic excesses. Much of the cult of the Sacred Heart is as indefensible in its language and sentiment as the extravagances of the Moravians in their devotion to the wounds of Christ, but that comparison is never drawn, of course. The very same kind of thing is to be praised, or excused, as long as it manages to keep loyal to the Papacy, but it is to be deplored and denounced if once it begins to differ from Rome. I suppose this is natural and inevitable in a Catholic writer, but it introduces an odd obliquity of regard from time to time.

The same tendency warps many of the judgements in these pages. I should have thought that it was about as obvious as anything could be in ecclesiastical history that it was the decay of prophecy and the growing worldliness of the Church that led to the rise of the Montanists and the Donatists. But no!—that would be to admit too much, and so we are told that there was 'no real substance in Tertullian's grievance against the Church about its laxity of discipline', and that 'the finding of the Church too worldly, and regretting the purer Christianity which marked earlier times' was 'the Donatists' affectation'. There is this kind of special pleading everywhere in the volume.

The real core of the book is in the pages which deal with Molinos and the Quietists, and with Pascal and the Jansenists. All that goes before and all that follows after is by way of preface and epilogue to the treatment of these seventeenth-century movements. In a dedicatory preface Monsignor Knox confesses that the first intention of the book was 'to fill up the picture outlined in Bossuet's *Variations*, in Moehler's *Symbolik*; here, I would say, is what happens inevitably, if once the principle of Catholic unity is lost! . . . All my historical figures, Wesley himself included, were to be a kind of rogues' gallery, an awful warning against illuminism.' But he goes on to say, with an engaging frankness, that in the writing his 'whole treatment of the subject became different: the more you got to know the men, the more human did they become, for better or for worse: you were more concerned to find out why they thought as they did

¹ Clarendon Press, 30s. net.

than to prove it was wrong'. The whole book wavers between these two points of view. But there is no sort of impartial treatment measured out to those who are on the other side of the fence. Thus there are references to 'the savage cruelty' that accompanies 'a certain type of religious fervour' and the presence of this among the Circumcellions and the Camisards; and elsewhere there is an allusion to 'the bloodthirsty ferocity' of the Covenanters. What about the siege of Béziers and the whole record of the Inquisition? If it comes to comparisons of savagery and ferocity the Papacy can show very many more examples, and very much worse ones, than all the Protestant communities put together. It is not wise for a Catholic apologist to invite such a comparison.

In the attempt to show that the Montanists were 'innovators rather than reactionaries' we are told that it is unbelievable 'that Christendom as a whole ... turned institutional instead of charismatic in the course of half a century'. It was not all in fifty years, of course, but otherwise that is exactly what did happen in the early Church. As the first spiritual impulses began to die down, organization prevailed over faith, as a great scholar once put it. Instead of a Church which consisted of groups united only by a common faith in Jesus as Lord, and by their love for one another as His disciples, it became a Church in which an official ministry ruled more and more, with the main emphasis on rites and organization. It is one more example, and the largest and saddest in history, of the truth of that penetrating epigram of Edward Caird's: 'The idea creates the organization, and then the organization destroys the idea.'

But Monsignor Knox must be credited with some candid admissions from time to time, as when he says that there was a plausibility about the Waldensian attitude (as to unworthy priests) and that Grosseteste, the great Bishop of Lincoln, 'showed his usual common sense when he represented to Innocent the Fourth that the true source of heresy was the corruptness of the clergy'. Again, it is surprising to read the admission in reference to the *Lettres Provinciales*, that the Jèsuists, because 'they were a new order, with no venerable traditions to hamper them with precedents, trod, it must be confessed, unwarily'—so unwarily that the Jesuit moral theology is described as 'these immature speculations', though it is suggested that Pascal was 'false to his own convictions when he attacked, for his own ends, a particular school of moral theologians'. But if that particular kind of casuistry had been the product of Huguenot or of Puritan theologians, we should have had here instead of excuses, words of mourning and lamentation and woe! Still, it is something that it is admitted that the immoral juggling with morality that Pascal pilloried for all time was at least 'unwary' and 'immature'.

Again it is confessed that in the time of the Counter-Reformation, 'prayer, like everything else in the post-Tridentine world, was standardized, regimented, almost to excess. Once more, reaction led to counter-reaction, and the seventeenth century became a century of mystics.' That is a neat summary of the spiritual ancestry of Molinos and his doctrine, but in making it Monsignor Knox has almost borrowed the language of A. H. Clough's gibe about Rome: 'Here, with metallic beliefs and regimental devotions.'

One who is not a Catholic cannot reconcile himself to the kind of ecclesiastical politics, marked by all sorts of scrupulous manœuvres, that went on in the case of Molinos. What was really a dispute as to variant methods of devotion

became a struggle for power on the part of the Jesuits, the Pope being a kind of pawn in the game, with backstairs intrigues in the Vatican and at Versailles going on all the time. The final result was a triumph for the Society of Jesus, who have been the power behind the throne in the Papal entourage ever since. When the prison of the Inquisition closed its doors upon Molinos it was not merely that a Spanish mystic was doomed to a lonely death. It was that the last hope for centuries to come of a spiritual rebirth of the Church of Rome had died. If the Jesuits had been defeated in the end, as they were in the beginning of the controversy, it is at least conceivable that there might have been a renewal of spiritual life along mystical lines that would have brought an internal reform of the Church, and checked both the superstition and the externalism that have gained ground ever since the Council of Trent. But it was not to be.

Methodism comes into Monsignor Knox's view as a species of 'enthusiasm'. His principal authorities for the Evangelical Revival are apparently Southey and Mr Arnold Lunn—an oddly assorted pair! He writes persistently of 'Wesleyanism': he ought to know better than that. He evidently has a considerable respect for John Wesley, though he manages to get in a few pin-pricks. Thus he makes repeated references to the psycho-physical phenomena that occurred occasionally in the early days of the movement, and in one place actually says that 'Wesley is for ever commenting on the various jumpers, jerkers, and roarers of his day; such things interested him vastly'. A casual reader would get the impression that almost every page of the *Journal* abounds in references of this sort. Now it is not worth while to make an elaborate exploration of eight large volumes to refute this, but I should be very much amazed if it were found that in the three thousand pages of the *Journal* there are more than a dozen taken up with a description of such things. Wesley never made much of them: he knew that they occur more or less in every popular religious movement.

There are a few points that I should question, like the statement that 'it is not likely that Eckhart had any influence on seventeenth-century thought'. Not directly, perhaps, but at second or third hand he had a good deal, for Nicholas of Cusa was profoundly influenced by Eckhart, as hundreds of parallels and actual citations prove, and some of the smaller mystical treatises of the Cardinal were (surprisingly enough) translated into English, and circulated in this country during the Commonwealth, and they had an influence on some of the sects of the time. This is a region that some scholar ought to explore in detail, but there is no doubt as to the fact that Eckhart, by way of Nicholas of Cusa, did influence religious thought in that age.

The book is interesting throughout, and it contains a good deal of curious matter that is not readily accessible elsewhere. It is admirably produced. I have only noted one misprint. On page 469 the name of the Moravian who encountered Wesley at Herrnhut is given as *Anne* Gradin: it should be Arvid Gradin.

HENRY BETT

GRAMMAR-SCHOOL DIVINITY

THE LIFE of St Paul in coloured strip cartoons on the back of the *Eagle* makes inevitable an unconscious comparison with the rocket adventure of Dan Dare on his way to Venus, which appears on the front page. It would be well to make a conscious comparison and admit the fact, obscured by much 'scripture period' teaching and by Sunday-school teaching of the 'heroes of the faith' kind, that, considered as an adventure story simply, Paul's life is not very good material. And this even when full account has been given of scourgings, attempted lynchings, trials, shipwreck, and fighting 'with wild beasts at Ephesus'. The danger of concentrating on the 'adventure' aspect of Bible stories lies in that your pupil will have either full or sub-conscious apprehension that you are selling second-rate goods; physical adventures far more exciting can be conceived and some have been achieved, he knows.

In any case it is misleading to present Paul without making it quite clear what it is that we claim to be significant in Paul—that he 'forged the vocabulary of the Faith'. Happily (indeed it is a part of the divine gift of happiness) the theology which he forged is an Event Theology. There would be very little hope if it were a question of trying to interest children in 'eternal' or abstract truths, and the tendency toward 'heroes of the faith' presentation is a recognition of this, incompletely thought out.

This brings me to the generalization about scripture-teaching method which I would present. All Bible-teaching to children which is not theological is culpable distortion. But the theology inheres in historical events, not in thought patterns. God intervenes in Hebrew history, either by causing the sea bed at the head of the Gulf of Akibah to rise under volcanic pressure at the right moment, or by causing the wind to change at the right moment to influence the tide below the quicksands near Suez; and the people are saved. He intervenes in the Person of His Son, making possible an Attachment which will be a detachment from the guilt complexes attendant upon self-conscious effort to fulfil the Law; and, potentially, all the peoples are saved. Thus the true ecclesia appears also as an event, literally the company of those called out by the prior events, not an association of people dedicated to the proposition that it would be nice if people were nice.

The Event does not become actual, however, merely because of the assertion that it happened. It is necessary to have systematic study of the prophets and historical books of the Old Testament, and to make a prolonged study of at least one gospel if grammar-school children are to appreciate the force of what is being claimed. The tendency in so many 'agreed syllabuses' is to skip lightly about from this to that aspect of 'Biblical Teaching' in a way which (it is hoped) will be clear both to grammar-school and secondary modern-school children. The latter need a quite different approach. But I am quite certain that for grammar-school children who meet insistence on systematic and scientific rigour as they approach other subjects, children who will become all the more conscious of comparative honesties of methods of study as they pass on to universities—for these a bright 'appreciation' approach is to degrade the

subject. An 'agreed syllabus' such as the one which, under the full pressure of my conscience, I am compelled to evade, should have the determined resistance of all specialist Divinity teachers if the more intellectual sixth-formers are to have a chance of moving toward their college careers as Christian believers.

A third aspect of my present experience which I would raise here is the discovery of the high importance of myth (in the technical sense) in Divinity teaching. Science students appreciate readily the need (so evident, for example, in nuclear physics) for provisional concepts of the nature of realities which have to be dealt with, but which can be given no literal image that will be permanently valid. Thus, also, it is important and useful to show how the pressure of the brute fact of the permanent flaw in all human willing precedes the attempts mythically to schematize the origin of this in the disobedience story. Yet the mythical representation is a necessity of thought. The wish to visualize life after this life is surprisingly evident in the minds of adolescent children. After all, they have statistical expectations of life of nearly half-a-century each. Yet once they have seen the force of the logic whereby the nature of God in Christian experience necessarily involves many mansions of pilgrim advance, they are curiously eager to have some schematic representation of possible heavens, whilst seeing the necessity also for regarding such conceptions as provisional and mythical. The 'above the sky' concept is seen to fit easily into medieval cosmology, whilst the re-tuning of a radio set to a universe of meaning and discourse always there even when not tuned in—this fits equally easily into a contemporary cosmology, to represent death as a half turn in time-space like turning over in bed.

'But will it really be like that?' they ask. 'The medieval did not really go "up" to heaven; may not the conception of a twist round in time-space like turning over in bed, which fits into our cosmology, be equally provisional?' 'Of course it probably is,' you reply. But the medieval Christian's expectation was not necessarily misleading—after death he may well have felt that his translation had been upward. I do not think that it is possible to avoid going into the question of What will it be like? A person of complete religious maturity no doubt would be content simply to trust that the God who once created him could as easily re-create him; but adolescent children do not ever, in my experience, rest content like that. 'Religion', said Karl Barth in his Romans commentary, 'is the possibility of the removal of every ground of confidence except confidence in God alone.' But that is the end of the road, not the adolescent cross-roads.

So vividly tip-toe is the eagerness of minds which have just realized themselves as minds for an offering of concrete expectation, that one runs ahead of this particular situation to ask oneself whether Communism, chief contemporary substitute religion and so strong among undergraduates at some universities, may not gain its strength from the fact that it does so offer concrete religious expectations. For the communist outside Russia there is the realized eschatology of the 'Socialist Sixth of the Earth'. For the Russian communist there are the co-operatives and the Five-year Plans. How very much Christians themselves have leaned upon mythical concrete expectations was shown by their violent reactions when the fundamental revision of such schemes was enforced by the Copernican revolution in astronomy and the publication of *The Origin*

of *Species*. Neither had implications denying Providence, but both had implications at variance with the specific providential set-up which Christians had been in the habit of envisaging.

That intelligent adolescents have a deep need to envisage a specific providential set-up, duly revised in front of current knowledge, my own regular experience insists. By far the easiest way of invoking eager attention from any form is to talk about spiritualism. In the middle school this is an ordinary interest in ghost stories, but in the upper school discussion soon makes it clear that now the real motive of interest is to know what the ghosts are up to—what there is to do 'there'.

For five years I have felt myself impelled to try to satisfy this desire not only out of a teacher's normal wish to be interesting, but also because of my own strong belief that a conception of the beyond as a realm of 'values' (this conception representing the austere retreat of religious philosophy under its recent impression that scientific cosmology has occupied all territories other than the realm of values) fails to do justice to the religion of the Incarnation.

One must proceed carefully, because speculation is not in itself a religious activity. It may be, I think, if it be associated with training to recognize the part played by Providence in one's own life story.

Proceeding forward thus safeguarded, there are, I think, two secure bases from which to start. One is Jesus' quite clear implication (in the Parable of the Talents) that the life to come will offer, to those who have qualified here, a wide extension of work and responsibility. The other is the implication of this parable and of the gospels as wholes that Love (—agape—God's love working through us) is the method of this work and of this responsibility and that when we are truly identified with this Love, we are given that which we love. In terms of concrete expectation this would imply, for example, that one who loved Oxford and who gave himself to the things for which Oxford stood in his mind, though not himself in any formal way connected with Oxford now, would, in a trans-dimensional sphere to which he would pass at death, possess Oxford whilst a present member of that university who does not devotedly care for it, would not.

On these lines might one not dare to build up large schemes of concrete mythical expectation? (Again I insist that 'myth' is here used in the technical sense and is meant to imply not untruth, but very much contrariwise to signify a means of reaching reality as reality was indeed reached when the 'myth' of the dying and rising God came true.)

The deductive method here suggested is nothing like so foreign to that of scientific thought as might at first appear. 'The General Theory of Relativity was, in its origin, a purely intellectual construction, in which observation and experiment played no part whatsoever. This has been asserted again and again by Einstein himself. "In a certain sense, therefore," he said, "I hold it true that pure thought can grasp reality."'¹

More securely a Christian cosmology would push forward not from 'pure thought', but from personal experience of Providence (as I insisted above). 'I had fainted unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living,' and unless older grammar-school children can be led to see a

¹ Sir Edmund Whittaker, *Listener*, 1st June 1960.

Divinity shaping their ends—sometimes with, sometimes against, their own rough-hewing—they might as well drop Divinity altogether.

It will be immediately apparent how the ethical teaching which is so important a part of 'Divinity' at the top of a grammar-school, closely connects with the approach here sketched. If that Love which is Christ in us is indeed Ultimate Substance, the earnest and the evidence should appear in the sphere of love and marriage. Sixth forms include seventeen-, eighteen- and nineteen-year-olds who are excitedly and properly occupied with speculation about these. It is not difficult to show here the insecurity, the tangential and reactive uncertainty of the love which is natural to us and the security of the Love which wishes to be in us. If these people can be led to go forward to the experience of their next few years with their eyes open to this distinction, they may become aware that they begin here to find their way about more worlds than this.

J. BUTTERWORTH

Recent Literature

Jesus and His Parables, by J. Alexander Findlay. (The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

Those who are familiar with Dr Findlay's books on the New Testament will expect to find much that is fresh and illuminating in this, the most recent of his writings, and they will not be disappointed. Again and again they will recognize the familiar freedom with which he moves in the world of the Synoptic Gospels, and the flashes of insight with which he interprets our Lord's words and reminds us of truths in danger of being forgotten. In the preface to this Fernley-Hartley lecture the author deplores the growing emphasis in modern evangelical theology on 'Christian ideas' rather than on 'common earthly men and women'. The suggestion of the book as a whole is that the remedy for those who are too much preoccupied with the 'theology of crisis' is to turn to the Parables of Jesus, which contrast so strikingly with much modern preaching and devotional literature. Jesus was 'intensely interested in the everyday life of the people around Him'. Here is one clue to the meaning of our Lord's parabolic teaching. It is consequently no surprise to us when, under the skilful hands of Dr Findlay, even the pages of Mr P. G. Wodehouse are made to yield a thoroughly illuminating comment on the nature of a Gospel parable. It is good to be reminded in this and other ways of what we may call the 'everyday homeliness' of much of the recorded teaching of our Lord, so long as we do not forget the presence—alongside such apparently simple words—of utterances and claims which for theological profundity are unsurpassed in the New Testament. More than once Dr Findlay touches on this other side of our Lord's teaching and illustrates his theme by quoting some very 'theological' verses from Charles Wesley. The motto facing the title-page of the book (Matthew 13²¹) reminds us that much in the parables finds its fullest meaning only in the doctrine of the Incarnation. All this makes us hope that Dr Findlay will give us another book which displays more fully the amazing union in the Synoptic Gospels of the utter homeliness and the unfathomable depths of the words of Jesus.

W. F. FLEMINGTON

The Gospel Message of St Mark, by R. H. Lightfoot. (Oxford University Press, 10s.)

Anyone who imagines that St Mark presents a 'simple Galilean Gospel' should read this book. The writer shows that far from being a straightforward narrative, easy to follow and understand, Mark does not readily yield up the key to its meaning or its structure. The Christ it exhibits is a profoundly mysterious and baffling figure. Dr Lightfoot finds the key to the problem in the apostolic *Kerygma*; and he works out C. H. Dodd's suggestion that the evangelist's aim was to set forth the saving facts of our Lord's life, death, and Resurrection. He succeeds in showing that, read in the right way, Mark is indeed 'a very remarkable work' and that the evangelist assembles his material by a 'frequently subtle and delicate arrangement'. The first half of the book consists of a sequence of four lectures on the subject indicated in the title. The remainder is devoted to discussions on special points, including one on Form Criticism. As in an earlier work, Dr Lightfoot contends that St Mark originally ended his Gospel at 16⁸ and that the question of a 'lost ending' does not arise. He undoubtedly proves that some of the arguments used to support the theory of a lost ending are unsound, but if the story is complete at 16⁸, it is curious that more than one attempt was made to round off the work. Those who were disturbed by the closing words of the Professor's Bampton Lectures some years ago will be reassured by the expression of his belief that 'with the help of the gospels the main features of the Lord's character and teaching may become truly and well known to careful thought and study'. On page 113, Isaiah 16¹⁰ should be 26¹⁰.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

The Religious Thought of St John, by F. K. Lee. (S.P.C.K., 17s. 6d.)

The author of this book, a parish priest, has read widely in the abundant literature on the subject, and has written an exposition, which, if it contains little that is new, does focus attention in an interesting as well as scholarly way upon some of the ideas which are characteristic in the Johannine theology. In the first chapter (of 31 pages), called Introduction, the author gives a short summary of what in his opinion are the most important results of the study of the Gospel and Epistles during the twentieth century. He makes clear that his own sympathies in critical questions of authorship, and so on, incline to the moderate conservative side. In the main part of the book he examines the leading ideas in the Gospel and First Epistle—God, the Word with God, the World lying in Darkness, the Light in the Darkness, Salvation, Eternal Life. He writes in a well-balanced way about the philosophic and religious affinities of the Fourth Gospel; about the blending of Hebrew and Hellenic elements in the conception of God, the world, salvation; about the parallels between the Fourth Gospel and Philo and the Hermetic literature in the use of characteristic words and phrases; and about the sacramental teaching of Chapter 6, the Paraclete, the New Commandment. In the final chapter on Theology and Ethics he contends that the ethical principles of the Johannine teaching are all dependent on St John's conception of God, that the basis of the unity of thought is that God so loved the world that He gave. From this, Creation and Incarnation were in a sense necessities of the Divine Being. This book is a useful guide to Johannine thought, as it is being interpreted today. One wishes that it could have been printed at a lower price. F. B. CLOGG

The Praises of Israel, by John Paterson. (Charles Scribner's Sons, 15s.)

In the words of the sub-title, we have here a series of 'studies literary and religious'. Prof. Paterson's aim is to present the Psalms as devotional material for life today. His well-written and interesting book is full of material which will promote a fuller understanding and a deeper appreciation of this storehouse of Israel's 'Praises'. The volume is in three sections. The first tells how the Psalter grew, and passes on to emphasize the 'new approach' to the understanding of the Psalms. This approach is that of Gunkel and Mowinckel—namely that the psalms originated in the religious cult and are associated with the worship of the community. Chapter Four is devoted to a full account of Gunkel's theory of Types (*Gattungen*), characterized by recurring type-formulae. This chapter is especially valuable, because details of this important theory are not readily available in this country. The second section deals in detail with selected Psalms, one from each of the main types. The third section, on the religious teaching of the Psalter, contains chapters on the Divine Revelation, Religion in Human Life, Sin, Retribution, and the Life Hereafter. Surprisingly, Dr Paterson is prepared to see a belief in the life hereafter in the Redeemer passage in Job 19^{25d}. The book is to be commended to the general reader who wishes to know how modern scholarship sheds new light on these ancient songs. NORMAN H. SNAITH

A Theological Word-Book of the Bible, edited by Alan Richardson. (S.C.M., 25s.)

This book fills a gap in the working minister's library. Unlike the cumbrous great dictionaries the volume is handy in size, and not too difficult to find one's way about. A dictionary, of course, is not easy to review adequately. A reviewer can sample various major articles, and find them satisfying (as the present reviewer found Prof. North's article on 'Sacrifice', for instance), or he may think them incomplete, only to discover that the missing material appears under another heading. To the present reviewer the least adequate article seemed to be that on 'Blood', and its defect did not seem to be made up in the articles on 'Covenant' or 'Fellowship'. There is here a change of emphasis, which may mean that the younger theologians are turning away from the

history of religion to the theology of revelation. At any rate, it is astonishing that articles on 'Blood' and 'Covenant' can be written without any reference to the fact that *koinōnia* and 'the blood of Jesus' are constantly associated (1 John 1⁷, Hebrews 2¹⁴, 1 Corinthians 10¹⁸, and a score of other passages). In the discussion of 'Rock', the Editor does not seem to appreciate the fact that, if Matthew 16¹⁸ is authentic, 'Thou art Peter', etc., was almost certainly uttered in Aramaic, and that the distinction between '*petros*' and '*petra*' on which he lays stress, could not be reproduced in that language, and so cannot be native to the mind of Jesus. As Karl Schmidt says, Strack-Billerbeck's effort to put Matthew 16¹⁸ back into Hebrew is vitiated by the desire to depreciate Peter. But these are perhaps only inevitable differences of opinion; there can be no doubt of the value of the service Canon Richardson and his collaborators have done to a whole generation of ministers. J. ALEXANDER FINDLAY

The Bible From Within, by A. G. Hebert. (Oxford Press, 8s. 6d.)

This volume is written for laymen and theological students in a simple and readable form and contains some of the main positions already known to readers of Father Hebert's larger volumes. Accepting the findings of biblical criticism, the writer uses them as a help to the understanding of the meaning of the original writers in the life of the community within which they wrote. The course of the spiritual development in biblical history is clearly traced, together with its fulfilment in Christ and His Church. The creation stories and the story of Eden are examined in the first place, the inevitable theological problems being examined with a clarity very helpful to the many who seek an understanding of fundamental Christian beliefs concerning man and his world. The Exodus is shown to be the keystone in the arch of Israel's faith. From the earlier prophets, through the Exile, the reader is brought to the Messianic hope, the beginning of post-exilic Judaism and the restored temple. The climax both of the history and the religious development is seen in the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ, and it is shown that from the point of view of the New Testament the hope and faith of the Old shine with a lustre which is the glory of the true Israel. T. POWLEY ADDISON

Christian Ethics, by R. C. Mortimer. (Hutchinson, 7s. 6d.)

The Bishop of Exeter, having already given us a theoretical outline of the principles of Christian conduct in *The Elements of Moral Theology*, now proceeds to application. His general position is that of the moderate Anglican Catholic; he draws by preference on the treasury of spiritual direction of the seventeenth-century divines, referring most to Baxter. After a preliminary discussion of the Biblical basis, of the ultimate authority of conscience, and of the peculiarly religious duties, he addresses himself to such matters as the duty of obedience (as itself a general virtue), and to the problems set by gambling, unsuccessful marriage, and the punishment of criminals. Every issue is examined clearly and soberly, and the writer draws on Natural Law, the New Testament, the general tradition of the Church, and relevant human circumstances without parade of detail. Without concealing his personal conclusions, Dr Mortimer fastens the reader's attention on the method by which moral problems are to be thought out. The book will be useful to all students of Christian ethics. The bibliography might have been made wider. T. E. JESSOP

St Augustine and the Donatist Controversy, by G. G. Willis. (S.P.C.K., 15s.)

This very thorough study of Augustine's struggle with the Donatists achieves more than its obvious aim. The first half of the book is an account of the schism and Augustine's thirty years of campaign which finally overthrew the sect. The last three chapters deal with his Doctrine of the Church, Church and State, and the Ministration of the Sacraments, 'forged under the pressure of Donatist teaching'. The struggle

to bring unity claimed a major share of Augustine's efforts as the leader of African Christianity. Pelagius and the Fall of Rome have jointly been held responsible for evoking much of his thinking. Mr Willis's study may not seem at first sight directly relevant to this, but, in fact, the contest with Donatism became formative of much in Augustine's teaching—especially regarding the appeal to the State to redress the wrongs of the Church. The Circumcellions were, no doubt, an awkward set of rascals and certainly many Donatists were intensely nationalist and opposed to Roman administration, but to call for police protection is one thing, and to ask for legislation and action by the State in the cause of one's Church quite another. Augustine was at first sure that to win schismatics back by any other way than that of peaceable persuasion was wrong: he brought himself at length to seek the aid of the secular arm. Thus there came to be one African Church—and he called it unity! Again, Mr Willis shows it was the clash with Donatism that made Augustine re-think the matter of the administration of the sacraments. His opponents had a clear-cut position, like Cyprian, but Augustine saw increasingly that the Church must be inclusive of many elements, and so came to his distinctions between valid and regular sacraments and their indelibility—whether in baptism or orders. If, in the first part of his study Mr Willis takes his readers not only into the wood to see the trees but into some very thorny thickets as well, he does bring them out to see the wood as an important part of the theological and historical landscape. One of the main results of the long dispute was the denial of the Donatist (and Cyprianic) demand for the rebaptism or reordination of heretics.

HAROLD S. DARBY

Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms 1521, by Gordon Rupp. (S.C.M., 9s.)

Hard on the heels of R. H. Bainton's monumental biography of Luther (reviewed in the last number of this journal) comes a study of his earlier years, which even those who can find the dollars for *Here I Stand* will not find superfluous. The author describes it as the result of an attempt to find a personally satisfying answer to the question: 'Who was Martin Luther?' He reveals more of the intricacy of the problems involved in Luther-research than does Bainton, and in some particulars he takes a different view. But the general picture of Luther and his work which emerges, is not essentially dissimilar, although it is inevitably less complete and is marked at some points by a rather unnecessary hesitancy and inconclusiveness. The old 'Catholic caricature' (with which Mr Rupp has dealt elsewhere) is dismissed in a couple of sentences as it deserves, and we are introduced instead to the soberer judgements of modern Catholic scholars like Kiefl, Lortz, and Hessen-Köln. We are also introduced to some of the best Continental and Scandinavian Lutheran scholarship, which for a good many years past has been shedding more and more light on the subject. The book thus contributes toward the filling up of a serious gap in English scholarship; and if it leaves quite a number of questions still to be answered, it also gives the promise of 'more extended studies', which we may hope will not be long delayed.

PHILIP S. WATSON

The Teaching of Calvin, by A. Mitchell Hunter. (James Clarke & Co., 15s.)

This is a new and revised edition, at a quite reasonable price, of a very good book, which has been out of print. It is fresh, lucid, and comprehensive. Some will think that its documentation is not sufficiently profuse, but the non-technical reader will appreciate the uninterrupted flow of the argument. Dr Hunter does not conceal Calvin's personal faults, and he deals faithfully with him in the matter of Servetus. He does not attempt to tone down the doctrine of predestination—showing its roots in the Occamist principle: 'Nothing is of itself good or evil, the freewill of God being the sovereign arbiter of what is so'—but he puts it in its place within the framework of

the whole system, and shows how Calvin's is one of the few theologies which really face the hard facts of life and provide an unshakeable assurance. In short, he gives us a balanced picture of both the man and his message, except that he does not do complete justice to Calvin's doctrine of the Church, even though he thinks that its importance has sometimes been overlooked. But Dr Hunter's main contention is that the essence of Calvinism lies not in a dogmatic system, but in the moralization of life by religion, in humble dependence upon God, and in patient submission to His holy will. Here, he urges, and not in the realm of doctrine, Calvinism must ultimately stand or fall.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

From Puritanism to the Age of Reason: A Study of Changes in Religious Thought within the Church of England, 1660-1700, by G. R. Cragg. (Cambridge Press, 12s. 6d.)

This closely knit but delightfully written and most interesting book has the rare distinction of covering the last forty years of the seventeenth century without wasting a paragraph on Charles the Second, James the Second, or their attendant politicians. Such notables only appear in the background as necessary stage-furniture, the centre place being reserved for the people whom the author regards as really influential. These are the quiet, reflective, scholarly folk who sensed, more clearly than the active participants in public affairs, that a new day had dawned, and that the land was sick and tired of religious strife. As Dr Cragg says: 'Calvinism had prepared its own undoing; it failed to use its great advantages to win the sympathies of ordinary Englishmen. With a reckless lack of moderation, the extremer sects multiplied extravagances until reasonable men were utterly antagonized. The undisciplined exuberance of certain Calvinists discredited the whole system of thought, and brought about its undoing.' This being the public temper, it was more than a coincidence that the men were at hand to show the way to better things. Every reader will be grateful to the author for his interpretation of the influence exercised by the group of contemporary scholars at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, itself a stronghold of Puritanism, whom the world knows as the 'Cambridge Platonists'. They were not a party and they sought no power, but they hold a place of particular importance, not only for what they taught, but for what they were. Listen to John Smith, perhaps the most winsome and persuasive of them all: 'That is not the best and truest knowledge of God which is wrought out by the labour and sweat of the brain, but that which is kindled within us by a heavenly warmth in our hearts: that which enables us to know and understand aright in the things of God must be a living principle of holiness within us.' Dr Cragg has other important chapters, which show that these men of the mid-century left a permanent imprint especially in preparing the way for the work of John Locke, with his 'Reason must be our last judge and guide in everything'. There is an excellent bibliography.

WILFRID L. HANNAM

The Churches in English Fiction, by Andrew L. Drummond. (Edgar Backus, Leicester, 12s. 6d.)

The sub-title of this book tells us that it is a literary and historical study, from the Regency to the present time, of British and American fiction. It is a work of immense industry, for there must be more than two hundred and fifty novels mentioned in the index and practically all of these are dealt with in the text by way of summary and a criticism. The work is therefore encyclopedic, except that it begins with the nineteenth century. It would have been better, I think, to have restricted the study to the greater novelists, omitting at any rate the very small fry, and to have extended the range backward to the beginnings of English fiction. Still, there is a value in the author's method, for it makes the book a real work of reference. One thing stands out prominently from the whole survey. Nonconformity has always fared very badly in English

fiction. Many of those who have written about it knew next to nothing of it, and in any case they wrote *de haut en bas*, with a permanent pose of contempt. The reason is, I believe, that Evangelical religion does not lend itself to description in a novel in the way that the Catholic type of religion does. A novelist can write a picturesque description of High Mass, with lights and colours, incense and chanting, but it is far more difficult to write a true account of penitence and faith, and 'the passion and the life whose fountains are within'. This book is well worth reading. On pages 43 and 85 there are misprints.

HENRY BETT

Religion and the Common Man, by E. C. Urwin. (S.C.M., 7s. 6d. Religious Book Club, 2s. 6d.)

The Church has lost touch with the masses of the people. In this book the Secretary of the Christian Citizenship Department of the Methodist Church sets out to show the relevance of the Christian Religion to the life of the working man—to his work, to his politics, and to his more private and domestic life. Preliminary chapters deal with the rival voices that clamour for possession of his soul. It is a guess that the author had in mind the Labour politicians who were brought up 'Chapel men' but are no longer committed Christians. It is doubtful, however, whether the S.C.M. Book Club includes many such men. The book will be read, and certainly not without profit, by members of Churches. On the whole they have been let off too lightly. The present lamentable situation is due to faults on both sides, but the failure of the Church to share the aspirations of the working-classes is as big a cause as any. A young member of a Bible Class was once asked to read a paper. He chose as his subject 'Christ and Socialism'. After the meeting the old Leader said to him: 'Joe, you can read a paper here on Christ, but not on Christ and Socialism.' The lad is now a member of Parliament and right out of touch with organized religion.

LESLIE M. WOOLLEN

The Story of Westminster College, by F. C. Pritchard. (The Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

Dr Pritchard has written this book, at the request of the College authorities, to celebrate its centenary. Himself an enthusiastic old student of Westminster, he has brought to the writing of the book an enlightened mind and a warm heart. He sets out with clarity and interest the contribution that has been made by Westminster to the field of education in the last hundred years. There are portraits and other illustrations. In the story we see the vision and idealism of our forefathers, and in particular of John Scott, the first Principal, who 'in an age of autocratic individualism believed in the rule of mutual trust and respect rather than fear'. That this bore fruit was demonstrated when Matthew Arnold invigilated at an examination by working with his back to the candidates. When he was questioned about this unorthodox way of carrying out his duties, he replied: 'Westminster men do not need watching.' Dr Pritchard points out how each subsequent Principal has made his own distinctive and distinguished contribution to the life of the College and in the wider field of national education. He shows too the influence of tutors and of the students themselves in keeping alive the spirit that inspired the College a hundred years ago. As he says: 'We see a record of service born of the faith that the real things are the old things, the things that time and fashion do not change, most of all faith in Jesus Christ. That is the secret of any prowess or reputation that Westminster College holds today.' This is a book not only for old students, though they will want to possess it, but for all who wish to be informed about what Methodism has done and is doing for education.

H. TREVOR HUGHES

The Second Homely Year, by Ida and Leslie Church. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)
Through Christ our Lord, by Georgia Harkness. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, \$1.25)

Dr and Mrs Church's *Second Homely Year* follows the same plan as the book with which last year they delighted many readers. They provide a portion for daily reading throughout the year. Each week begins with a Sunday text and closes with a Saturday prayer. Every Tuesday Dr Church speaks in his own characteristic fashion, and every Thursday Mrs Church makes her own contribution. For Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, of each week, quotations are given from a wide range of readings, in verse and in prose. The book is enriched with twenty very beautiful photogravure illustrations, depicting for the most part British country and domestic life. This is a book both for odd moments or the bedside, and for more continuous reading. Altogether it has a note of intimacy, as though these two friends were sharing with us, as indeed they are, their own thoughts about life and the treasures they have garnered for themselves. 'Homely' indeed the book is, for it deals with matters that, in Bacon's words, 'come home to men's business and bosoms'. It is 'Homely', too, in the sense in which Mother Julian of Norwich uses the word: 'For our Lord Himself is sovereign homeliness, and so homely as He is, so courteous He is, for He is very courteous.' It is that homely, courteous Lord who in many a word from this book will draw near to those who read, with His own gifts of courage and peace and hope.

The other book named above, also intended for daily use, comes from American Methodism. It is described as 'a devotional manual based on the recorded words of Jesus'. For a period of five months it provides a daily scheme of meditation—first some memorable word of our Lord, with a brief interpretative comment, then questions for self-examination, then what the old masters of meditation would have called a 'colloquy', a prayer in which the soul that has been listening to the voice of God now speaks back to Him in penitence and supplication and resolve. A small book, but one of real value to those whose hearts echo the disciples' petition: 'Lord, teach us to pray.'

FRANCIS B. JAMES

Conformed to His Image, by Oswald Chambers. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 6s.)
What Worries Me, by Ronald Selby Wright. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)
With God and His Friends, by Francis B. James. (The Epworth Press, 5s.)
High Days and Ordinary, by Robert Strong. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)
Vestry Invocations, by George R. Kirkley. (The Epworth Press, 6s.)

The first of these is a 'mixed grill' whose ingredients range from 'Christian Thinking' and 'The Psychology of Faith' to 'Notes on Lamentations' and 'Perfect Love'. The dogmatic tone will alienate some readers, and the almost incredible disregard of punctuation, added to an inconsequential arrangement of themes, will bewilder others. But of the evangelical enthusiasm of the author, there can be no doubt.

Very different is the Radio Padre's reprint of some of his broadcast talks, though they are not about what worries *him* so much as what worries his hearers and readers. Mr Wright knows men and their minds, and deals with their problems both sympathetically and realistically. Here is certainty without dogma, humour allied with wisdom, and homely illustration.

The many who enjoy Francis B. James's musings for the quiet hour in the *Methodist Recorder* will be glad to have some thirty of them reprinted in a neatly produced and handy form. This beloved writer has so caught the passion of the mystics that sometimes his comments read like a continuation of his extracts, so like are they in matter and manner, spirit and style. There is rhythm and resonance too in the prayers at the end of every theme.

Vestry Invocations seeks to fill a gap in our books of prayers. In it there is an economy of words, and every phrase is packed with thoughts, so that the whole book sparkles.

Something simpler and more pertinent is required for vestry use, but as a manual of devotion for the preacher preparing himself to lead in worship this is a most valuable and really stimulating book.

The last book collects thoughtful studies of the minds and lives of people after they had met Jesus as described in the New Testament. It combines psychological penetration with logical reasoning. Most of the chapters might have been the testimonies of Oxford Groupers. Here is something new and charming, but also masterly and convincing.

HAROLD MALLINSON

Methodist Notes on the Beginners, Primary, Junior, Senior, and Young People's Graded Lesson Course for 1951, edited by Ernest H. Hayes. (Methodist Youth Dept., *Beginners* 4s., others, 5s. per volume.)

In Methodist Sunday-schools, with nearly 800,000 children in them, there are 120,000 teachers. They play a vital part in the national life. They also accept a supreme responsibility in the Kingdom of God. The Bible is, of course, and must always be, the basis of Sunday-school teaching. But it is one thing for an adult to read the Bible and understand it, and quite another to teach it to children. To do this adequately requires a background of knowledge, a technical skill, and a wealth of illustrative material which few people possess. The Methodist Youth Department, always alive to their responsibilities and keen to ensure that their teachers are equipped for their task, meet the teachers' needs year by year in *Methodist Notes*. In this series of notes on the Graded Lesson Course, edited by Ernest H. Hayes, the Secretary of the British Lessons Council, the combined experience and skill of experts in teaching-method and Biblical knowledge is made available for all at a very low cost. Co-editors with Mr. Hayes for this 1951 series are Professor Eric S. Waterhouse, the Rev. H. Vincent Capsey, Dr Norman H. Snaith, Dr Wilbert F. Howard and Dr R. Newton Flew for the Beginner's, Primary, Junior, Senior, and Young People's 'Notes' respectively. It would be impossible to review in detail the lessons in each of the sections or to mention by name all the contributors. It is sufficient to say that at no point in the series is there any serious weakness, and at some points the notes reach positive brilliance. Every avenue of approach to the child mind is used. Each lesson has appended to it suggestions for activities which make use of the most varied materials, and have the charm of simplicity and practicability even in the smallest schools. The background notes for teachers and suggestions for the afternoon service are carefully and fully worked out, and each lesson is so presented that the busiest of teachers can quickly master it.

RALPH KIRBY

From My New Shelf

N.B.—For lack of space it has only been possible to give short notices of a number of important books.

The Belief in Progress, by John Baillie. (Oxford Press, 10s. 6d.) This is a very timely book. It gives the educated man just the *prolegomena* that he needs before he can discriminate among the babel of tongues that assails him now on the theme of 'progress'. Dr Baillie's method is in the main historical and he chiefly examines 'the history of the *idea*' that there is such a thing as progress. He begins away back beyond the Greeks and comes down to the present century, with many a telling quotation on the way. For the most part he moves among the philosophers. He brings out the truth that a belief in the progress of society does not 'spring eternal in the human breast', but is the product of the Bible (in both its parts), mediated, and not adequately mediated, through the Church. He shows, further, that when the idea was

secularized it was distorted into the half-truth that is 'ever the worst of lies'. At the end of his book, however, he leaves the purely historical method to ask: 'Is there a Christian doctrine of social progress?' The title of the chapter is 'Toward a Conclusion' and the conclusion is that there is such a doctrine, and a doctrine that can be held even amid the chaos of today. Here he briefly surveys recent discussion of the New Testament phrase, 'The Kingdom of God'. For him apocalyptic is symbol—but true symbol. Being by Dr John Baillie, the book, of course, is lucid as well as scholarly and exact. Having read this book, a Christian, as he offers the prayer, 'Thy name be hallowed, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done—as in heaven, so on earth', may believe that God, though He hides His ways in the thick darkness is answering it.

The Problem of Christ in the Twentieth Century, by W. R. Matthews. (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) In view of recent New Testament study (especially on the Fourth Gospel), of the new psychology and the better kinds of new philosophy, the Dean of St Paul's thinks that it is time to attempt to restate Christology. In these Maurice Lectures he makes some tentative suggestions and asks many questions to which he thinks we should begin to seek an answer. He has, of course, the gift of clarity even when describing what is not clear! His pivotal word is 'personality' (with 'consciousness' and 'experience'). Chalcedon knew it not, spite terminology; psychology has enriched it with the unconscious mind, telepathy and extra-sensory perception; philosophy, with its 'patterns of behaviour', fails to do justice to it. So we must seek a distinctive Christian philosophy—and thereby a restatement of Christology—that takes account of all these things. The Dean claims that we now need a 'reverent temerity'. The phrase exactly describes the temper of this small but pioneering book.

The Coherence of Christian Doctrine, by Kenneth E. Kirk (S.P.C.K., 1s.) In this Gore Memorial Lecture the Bishop of Oxford illustrates the truth that theology is organic by showing that the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Atonement go indissolubly together.

In the End, God . . . by J. A. T. Robinson. (Jas. Clarke and Co., 6s.) This is a book on eschatology and the Christian doctrine of history. Dr Robinson takes account of current discussions on myth, realized eschatology, and Christian existentialism. Perhaps the best chapter in a good book is the one on '*Kairos* and *Chronos*'. The writer's purpose is 'to provoke' discussion on a theme that now challenges the Church. On several points there is room for discussion, but the book 'breaks ground' admirably. It will only be of service, however, to those who use their minds.

The Theology of Albert Schweitzer for Christian Enquirers, by E. N. Mozley. (Adam and Charles Black, 7s. 6d.) Apart from the Epilogue this is a book for beginners. It confines itself however to what Schweitzer teaches and says nothing of the discussion of the questions, 'Is Schweitzer wholly right?' and 'Does he cover all the ground?' Colonel Mozley has made a useful *catena* of quotations from Schweitzer's four volumes on the New Testament, with connecting notes. But as Epilogue Schweitzer himself has contributed thirty pages on 'The Conception of the Kingdom of God in the Transformation of Eschatology'. In these he gives a rapid survey of the results, in the long history of theology, of the postponement of the Parousia to the distant future. His leading idea is that the Church had to find room somehow for a 'doctrine of continuous (i.e. repeated) forgiveness'. Rome went astray here but, in a characteristic phrase, Luther was 'historically wrong but religiously right'. So too is modern Protestantism with its doctrine that the Kingdom of God is to 'develop in this world'.

The Old Testament against its Environment, by G. Ernest Wright. (S.C.M., 6s.) Prof. Wright is one of a number of Old Testament experts who maintain that, whatever Israel adopted and adapted from other peoples, its religion was unique from Moses onward. His method is to illustrate the developed polytheism of Ugarit, Mesopotamia, and Egypt, under 'the nature of God, the meaning of life and history, and the

worship and service of God', and to show Israel's *differentia*. A very useful book for students who want to keep up to date.

Notes on the Hebrew Text of Genesis XL-XLIV, by Norman H. Snaith. (The Epworth Press, 6s.) Another of Dr Snaith's excellent aids to beginners in Hebrew.

The Book of the Acts, a Little Commentary, by M. D. R. Willink. (Religious Education Press, Wallington, 3s.) This 'Pathfinder' book lives up to its name. It is meant for middle-teeners, but would serve almost anyone. The writer both 'knows his stuff' and knows how to 'get it across'. But ought 'God-fearer' and 'God-fearing' to be used for two quite different Greek words? Such flaws, however, are few and slight. In this book 'Acts' comes alive.

The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians, by John A. Allan. (S.C.M., 6s.) A Torch Commentary. Alike in his Introduction, in his paraphrases of the paragraphs of the Epistle, in his notes on particular verses, and in three (out of four) short essays, Dr Allan keeps the aim of the series steadily in view—while not neglecting other things, 'to draw out the theological significance of the Bible in a simple manner'. He has done a hard thing well.

The Eschatology of the Epistle to the Hebrews, by W. Robinson (from Overdale College, Selby Oak, Birmingham 29; 1s. 4d.) After a long prelude Dr Robinson (a) shows that a number of phrases in the Epistle to the Hebrews imply an eschatology, and (b) seeks to show that it is 'realized' eschatology. A Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture.

Practical Christianity, by W. Robinson. (Christian Action Fellowship, 30 Beaconsfield Road, Birmingham 12; 1s.) Six Broadcast Talks on (the shorter form of) the Lord's Prayer in the 'Lift up Your Hearts' series.

The Everlasting Gospel, by Edgar Newgass. (Charles Skilton, 12s. 6d.) In this 'panorama of the English Bible' there are twenty-four plates, reproducing title-pages, etc., of documents from Cædmon's paraphrases to King James's version. In some eighty pages Mr Newgass describes the authors and occasions of the translations, seeking to set them in the context of the story of Christianity in Britain from its beginning onward. Here he is not an expert.

The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England, by J. C. Dickinson. (S.P.C.K., 20s.) This book falls into three parts—an account of the obscure origins of communities that copied the life of the Church after Pentecost, whose members came to be called *canonici regulares*, and ultimately claimed to follow the Rule of St Augustine; the story of the spread of the Order into England in and about the twelfth century and of its place in the life of the English Church; and five Appendixes, including a discussion of the authorship of the Rule and a copy of it. Mr Dickinson, having examined 'thousands of early bulls and charters granted to houses of regular canons', says again and again that there is still much to do! But his work, so well done and so meticulously documented, is a model for any who continue his researches into this neglected subject.

St Francis in Italian Painting, by George Kaftal. (Geo. Allen and Unwin, 12s. 6d.) In this book there are thirty-nine reproductions of medieval paintings of stories of St Francis. In some the outlines are not very clear and in some there are smudges, but this is no doubt because of the present state of the paintings. The book's purpose is to illustrate the influence of the Saint in the religious life of Italy in the two centuries and a half after his death. Opposite each painting (with a list of Errata) Dr Kaftal prints a medieval account of the story that it portrays. He also provides an introduction containing a brief sketch of Francis's life and notes on the range of paintings and on the medieval books about him.

Pascal's Short Life of Christ, translated with an Introduction by Emile Cailliet and John C. Blankenagel. *Johann Georg Hamann, an Existentialist*, by Walter Lowrie. (Princeton Pamphlets, Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey).

Pascal, largely following Jansen, drew up a kind of Harmony of the four Gospels,

attempting a strictly chronological order. He inserted a few comments, chiefly borrowed from the Fathers. The little work is interesting rather than important.

Kierkegaard owed much to Hamann. Dr Lowrie introduces the latter to English readers. He sketches his life, largely spent in poverty at Königsberg, and shows how it is related to his writings. There follow some interpretative notes on some of the latter. They were brief, obscure, controversial, and often humorous. Hamann challenged the postulates of his friend Kant's *Critique* before it was published.

The Polished Shaft, by W. E. M. Brown (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) This book consists of 'studies' in the use of culture in the service of religion (and morality) in the eighteenth century and after. About half the volume is given to James Hervey. Other names are William Gilpin and Thomas Love Peacock.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Vetus Testamentum, January (E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands, £2 per annum).

Das Königtum in den Reichen Israel und Juda, by A. Alt.

The Greek Translator of Isaiah and his Interest in *Doxa*, by L. H. Brockington.

Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll, by S. Talmon.

The Age of the Scrolls, by P. Kahle.

This new quarterly is sponsored by the International Organization of Old Testament Scholars.

The Rev. G. W. Anderson represents Britain on the Editorial Board. Contributions may be in English or German or French. A much-needed focus for the Old Testament scholarship of the world.

The Hibbert Journal, January (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.).

Distance and Relation (on the nature of man), by Martin Buber.

Liberal Christianity, by W. R. Inge.

The Worship of the Absolute, by Nicol MacNicol.

Old Testament Interpretation (from the Rabbis onward), by O. S. Rankin.

Literature and Theological Climate, by John Rowland.

The International Review of Missions, January (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.).

A Survey of the Year 1950 (world-wide), by the Editors.

Indian Communism and the Indian Church, by John Bathgate and J. Russell Chandran.

Christian Higher Education in the New India, by Percival Spear.

Religious Freedom in Indonesia, by C. A. O. Van Nieuwenbuijze.

The Expository Times, January (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 3d.).

Ministerial Training and Vocational Needs, by Matthew Black.

From Humanism to Christian Humanism, by Charles Gimblett.

Philip Doddridge (1702-51), by F. H. Durnford.

do, February.

The Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus, by G. H. Boobyer.

The Ministry of Fear, by T. Tudor Rhys.

World Salvation, by William E. Wilson.

do, March.

Some Presuppositions of a Christian Sociology, by G. V. Jones.

The Mind of Christ: What He Found in Scripture, by John Macleod.

The First Seven Years (in the Ministry), by James N. Alexander.

The Scottish Journal of Theology, December (Oliver and Boyd, 3s. 6d.).

The Real Church (translated), by Karl Barth.

Conversion, an Introductory Statement, by Stephen C. Neill.

The Suffering Servant: Current Scandinavian Discussions, by Christopher R. North.

The Relation of God and Man in the Writings of Nicolas Berdyaev, by Donald G. M. Mackay.

A Study of Sin and Salvation in terms of C. G. Jung's Psychology, by J. W. D. Smith.

The Congregational Quarterly, January. (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.).

Law and Liberty in Puritanism, by Geoffrey F. Nuttall.

Through the Darkness: a Letter written (from Germany) to friends abroad, by Gertrud von le Fort.

Developments in Psycho-Analysis beyond Freud, by H. J. S. Guntrip.

Bulletins on Soviet Economic Development, Nos. 1 to 4 (Faculty of Commerce, Birmingham University, 20s. the set).

The first number in a series to provide 'an analytical summary of material published in the Soviet Union'.

Our Contributors

SANTE UBERTO BARBIERI
D.D.

A. D. BELDEN
D.D.

HENRY BETT
M.A., LITT.D.

J. F. BUTLER
M.A., PH.D.

JAMES BUTTERWORTH
B.D. (LOND.)

A. RAYMOND GEORGE
M.A.

T. FRANCIS GLASSON
M.A., D.D.

HENRY HOGARTH
B.A.

WILBERT F. HOWARD
F.B.A., M.A., D.D.

D. W. LAMBERT
M.A.

WILLIAM F. LOPTHOUSE
M.A. (OXON)
D.D. (ABERDEEN)

THOMAS D. MEADLEY
B.A., B.D.

C. RYDER SMITH
B.A., D.D.

B. FOSTER STOCKWELL
D.D.

HENRY PITNEY VAN DUSEN

PHILIP S. WATSON
M.A.

Bishop of the Central Conference of the Methodist Church in Latin America (Area of the River Plate and Bolivia).

Congregational Minister. Superintendent Minister of Whitefield's Central Mission, London, for nearly twelve years. Member of the Federal Free Church Council and World Brotherhood Federation. Vice-President, Univ. of Lond. Society. Author of many religious books, including *Pax Christi*. Contributor *Manchester Evening News*.

Methodist Minister. Tutor in Church History at Handsworth College, Birmingham, 1923-43; Principal 1940-3. President of the Methodist Conference 1940. Author of *Johannes Scotus Erigena* (1925), *Joachim of Flora* (1931), *Nicholas of Cusa* (1932), *Studies in Literature* (1929), *Studies in Religion* (1929), *The Spirit of Methodism* (1937), *The Hymns of Methodism* (1945), *The Reality of the Religious Life* (1949), etc.

Successively Demy of Magdalen College, Oxford; Henry Fellow at Harvard University; Student and Assistant Tutor of Didsbury College, Manchester; Professor of Philosophy, Madras Christian College; Army Officer; Army Chaplain; Editorial Secretary of the Christian Literature Society, Madras.

Divinity Master, New Mills Grammar School, Derbyshire. Contributor to *Hibbert Journal*.

Lamplough Professor of Systematic and Pastoral Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds.

Methodist Minister. Author of *The Second Advent* and *Thomas Glasson: Lay Preacher*.

Methodist Minister. Student of French religion.

Principal of Handsworth College, Birmingham, and Professor of New Testament Language and Literature and Classics; Lecturer in Hellenistic Greek, Birmingham University. President Methodist Church 1944 and 1945. Awarded the Burdett Bronze Medal of the British Academy, 'for distinguished contributions to Biblical studies'. Author of *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation: Christianity according to St. John*. Contributor to theological journals.

Sometime History Scholar Jesus College, Cambridge. Tutor, Cliff College, 1924-38. Since engaged in Ecumenical work, training lay missionaries. Principal, Lebanon College, Berwick-on-Tweed.

Principal and Tutor in Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Handsworth College, 1925-40; President Methodist Church, 1929-30. Author of *F. H. Bradley*, and many books on theology.

Methodist Minister.

Principal, Richmond College, London University, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, 1932-40. President Methodist Church, 1931. Author of many theological books.

Director of the Union Theological Seminary (*Facultad Evangelica de Teologia*), Buenos Aires, Argentina.

President: Union Theological Seminary, New York City. Presbyterian Minister (1924). Instructor in Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Union Theological Seminary (1926-7); Assistant Professor (1927-31); Associate Professor (1931-6); Dean of Students (1932-9). Author of numerous works, including *Methodism's World Mission* (1940), *What is the Church doing?* (1943), and *They found the Church there* (1945).

Tutor in Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Handsworth College, Birmingham. Translator of *Agape and Eros II*; author of *The State as a Servant of God* and *Let God be God!*